VOL. XLVI NO. 3

The Catholic Historical Review

MARTIN R. P. McGUIRE ROBERT TRISCO
JOHN TRACY ELLIS
Managing Editor

ADVISORY EDITORS

WILLIAM J. COLEMAN, M.M.
Maryknoll Seminary

EDWARD D. McSHANE, S.J.
Alma College

MARSHALL DILL, Jr.
Dominican College of San Rafael

FREDRICK B. PIKE
University of Notre Dame

DAVID J. HERLIHY
Bryn Mawr College

VINCENT G. TEGEDER, O.S.B.
St. John's University
Collegeville

Table of Contents

OCTOBER, 1960

ARTICLES

Catholics and the Blair Education Bill . . . . *John Whitney Evans* 273
The Parma Letters and the Dangers to Cardinal Pole . . . . *George B. Parks* 299

BOOK REVIEWS 318
NOTES AND COMMENTS 371
BRIEF NOTICES 378
PERIODICAL LITERATURE 392
BOOKS RECEIVED 402

BOOK REVIEWS

Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche. Vol. 1, *A-Baronius;* Vol. 2, *Barontus-Cölestiner;* Vol. 3, *Colet-Fastenberger;* Vol. 4, *Faith and Order—Hannibaldis.* (Michael Buchberger). Martin R. P. McGuire 318

The Historic Reality of Christian Culture. A Way to the Renewal of Human Life. (Christopher Dawson). Stanley J. Idzerda 324

Popes through the Ages. (Joseph S. Brusher, S.J.). Robert Trisco 325

Ecumenical Councils in the Catholic Church. An Historical Survey. (Hubert Jedin). Albert J. Loomie 329

The Idea of Reform. Its Impact on Christian Thought and Action in the Age of the Fathers. (Gerhart B. Ladner). Godfrey L. Diekmann..... 329

The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew. (Francis Dvornik). Henry G. J. Beck 332

The Early Churches of Rome. (Emile Mâle). Guy Ferrari 333

Prester John, the Letter and the Legend. (Vsevolod Slessarev). Joseph F. O'Callaghan 334

Early Franciscan Government. Elias to Bonaventure. (Rosaline Brooke). Cyprian J. Lynch 335

A Reformation Paradox: The Condemned New Testament of the Rostock Brethren of the Common Life. (Kenneth A. Strand). George J. Undreiner 337

The Religious Orders in England. Vol. III: *The Tudor Age.* (David Knowles). Marvin R. O'Connell 338

Holy Writ or Holy Church, the Crisis of the Protestant Reformation. (George H. Tavard). James H. Smylie 340

The Riddle of Roman Catholicism. Its History, its Beliefs, its Future. (Jaroslav Pelikan). Robert A. Graham 341

Der Karmelitengeneral Nikolaus Audet und die Katholische Reform des XVI. Jahrhunderts. (Adrianus Staring, O. Carm.). Raphael M. Huber 343

The Lives of Ange de Joyeuse and Benet Canfield. (Jacques Brousse). Edward D. McShane 344

L'Interdetto di Venezia del 1606 e i Gesuiti. Silloge di documenti con introduzione. (Pietro Pirri, S.I.). Eric W. Cochrane 345

A Pearl to India. The Life of Roberto de Nobili. (Vincent Cronin). Antonio Sisto Rosso 347

Mary Ward, 1585-1645. (Mary Oliver, I.B.V.M.). Georgiana McEntee... 349

Christianity in a Revolutionary Age: A History of Christianity in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries. Vol. I: *The Nineteenth Century in Europe. Background and the Roman Catholic Phase.* (Kenneth Scott Latourette). Roger Aubert 350

Revolution und Kirche. Studien zur Frühgeschichte der Christlichen Demokratie (1789-1850). (Hans Maier). George Bonnin 353

Vatican Diplomacy. A Study of Church and State on the International Plane. (Robert A. Graham, S.J.). Alan F. Westin 354

Church and Parliament: The Reshaping of the Church of England, 1828-1860. (Olive J. Brose). Gilbert A. Cahill 356

Cardinal Newman As An Historian. (Thomas S. Bokenkotter). Florence D. Cohalan 357

The Life of Benedict XV. (Walter H. Peters). Joseph P. Christopher 359

The Russian Revolution and Religion (Boleslaw Szczesniak). Raymond T. McNally 363

Christianity in Conflict. A Catholic View of Protestantism. (John A. Hardon, S.J.). Charles S. Braden 365

The Church and the Nations. (Adrian Hastings). Thomas T. McAvoy ... 367

Their Rights and Liberties. The Beginnings of Religious and Political Freedom in Maryland. (Thomas O. Hanley, S.J.). Sister Joan De Lourdes Leonard 368

The Catholic Historical Review

Vol. XLVI OCTOBER, 1960 No. 3

CATHOLICS AND THE BLAIR EDUCATION BILL

By

JOHN WHITNEY EVANS*

The bill for federal support of education proposed by Senator Henry William Blair of New Hampshire during the 1880's stands as one of the more significant landmarks along the course that such legislation has followed in the history of government relations to the schools of the nation. First introduced in Congress on December 6, 1881,[1] the bill was passed on three occasions by the Senate,[2] only to be rejected each time by the House; finally, on March 20, 1890, the measure failed in the fourth attempt to have it passed through the Senate.[3] Of the debates stimulated by the bill, it was said that "they unquestionably rank among the finest ever held in Congress or any legislature dealing with educational affairs."[4] Indeed, they remain today a rich source for various phases of what has become a classical constitutional debate as to which governmental agency, local or federal, should bear the greater responsibility for common education in the Republic. Furthermore, the debates over the Blair Bill shed light on a number of political, sectional, and social issues of the period.[5] Prominent among these is what Higham has labelled the "last phase of nativism," viz., the frantic fear prevalent during the closing quarter of the nineteenth century that Catholics, led by their hierarchy, were bent upon demolishing the newly forged spearhead of American nationalism, the public school.[6]

---

* Father Evans teaches American history in Cathedral High School, Duluth, Minnesota.

[1] *Congressional Record,* 47th Cong., 1st Sess., 1881, XIII, 21.

[2] *Ibid.,* 48th Cong., 1st Sess., 1883, XV, 2723; *ibid.,* 49th Cong., 1st Sess., 1886, XVII, 2105; *ibid.,* 50th Cong., 1st Sess., 1888, XIX, 1223.

[3] *Ibid.,* 51st Cong., 1st Sess., 1890, XXI, 2491.

[4] Gordon Canfield Lee, *The Struggle for Federal Aid: A History of the Attempts to Obtain Federal Aid for the Common School, First Phase, 1870-1890* (New York, 1949), p. 147.

As is not infrequently the fate of proposals that are destined to traverse waters stirred by the strongest winds of prejudice, the education bill of Senator Blair was launched quite easily and with a readily ascertained destination. "The representative form of government cannot exist unless the people are competent to govern themselves," [7] declared the author of the measure on June 13, 1882, as his bill embarked on its legislative journey. The population two years earlier had numbered slightly over fifty millions, with a voting population estimated at ten millions. Approximately two millions of these were illiterate, and thus "the prey of the demagogue or the victims of prejudice . . . [holding] the balance of power in almost every state in the nation at large." [8] Nor did it seem that current educational effort was adequately taking into account the predictable needs of the future. Reviewing school statistics, Senator Blair concluded that of the eighteen millions of children then of school age, seven out of twelve would grow up in "absolute ignorance of the English alphabet." [9]

Having graphed the general contour of the educational needs of the nation, Senator Blair's address of 1882 then turned to a review of national resources. The *Reports* of the Bureau of the Census from 1869-1880 were examined to show that the value of taxable property had not risen in proportion to the growth in population. This condition was especially serious in the South, where the ratio of children to adults was higher, and the per capita wealth lower. Moreover, southern youth were not concentrated in large metropolitan areas, but were scattered across miles of thinly settled farm lands or clustered in numerous small villages. An additional aggravating factor in the South was the presence of six million new citizens, the emancipated slaves. Nearly seventy per cent of these Negroes could neither read nor write, and scarcely any of them possessed property that could be taxed for the support of schools. Senator Blair believed that a ten-year program of federal aid to the schools would enable the nation to surmount its formidable educational challenge. The plan he offered for the consideration of the Senate would give fifteen million dollars to the states and territories in the first year, with the appropriation to decrease by a million dollars each year until a decade had expired. The funds would be distributed annually according to the proportion that obtained between the total population in each state and territory and the population therein that was illiterate as determined by the census of 1880. The aid was to be granted without distinction of race or color, and where separate schools were maintained, the support was to be divided on the basis of comparative enrollments.[10]

---

[5] Cf. William A. Mitchell, "Religion and Federal Aid to Education," *Law and Contemporary Problems,* XIV (Winter, 1949), 113-143; James Bartley Clyne, "The Catholic Attitude towards Federal Aid to Education in the United States, 1870-1892," (unpublished master's thesis, Department of Education, The Catholic University of America, n. d.); Allen J. Going, "The South and the Blair Education Bill," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review,* XLIV (September, 1958), 267-290.

[6] John Higham, *Strangers in the Land. Patterns of American Nativism* (New Brunswick, 1955), pp. 6, 28 f, 59-63, and 70 f.

[7] *Congressional Record,* 47th Cong., 1st Sess., 1882, XIII, 4821.

[8] *Ibid.,* p. 4824. Cf. also Edgar W. Knight, *Education in the South* (Chapel Hill, 1924), pp. 1-10; and Arthur Meier Schlesinger, *The Rise of the City, 1878-1898* (New York, 1933), pp. 160 ff.

[9] *Congressional Record,* 47th Cong., 1st Sess., 1882, XIII, 4828 ff.

The attitudes that Catholics might assume toward this ambitious and novel plan had already been somewhat determined a decade earlier when an article had appeared in the January, 1871, issue of the *Atlantic Monthly,* presaging one of the major themes Blair would utilize in the late 1880's. Henry Wilson had contributed to this issue of the *Atlantic* an essay entitled "The New Departure of the Republican Party," a clarion calling Republicans to gather up the loose ends of the post-reconstruction republic and weave from them a new national unity through the diffusion of common school education and the rehabilitation of the South according to the Republican pattern. Citing New England as the first area of the nation fully to grasp what he termed "the great idea that education was an essential element of social and civil prosperity," Wilson stated that one of the greatest obstacles to acquiring the "more desirable traits of the New England and American character" was the "conditions and circumstances of the emigrant, the freedman, and the operative." He lamented that

---

[10] *Ibid.,* pp. 4831 f. During these years "illiteracy" was officially defined by the Bureau of Education as the "inability to write" [Lee, *op. cit.,* p. 32]. Blair repeated this speech with minor changes before the first session of the 48th Congress on March 18, 1884, at which time the speech lasted from 12:45 P.M. until past 4 P.M. [*Congressional Record,* 48th Cong., 1st Sess., 1884, XV, 1999-2032]. He was described as "long winded . . . speaking in metallic tones" [Baltimore *Catholic Mirror,* February 15 and March 8, 1890]. The address was characterized as "one of the dullest arguments ever heard in the chamber" by the antagonistic *Courier-Journal* of Louisville [March 19, 1884].

> . . . even when within reach of the common school, the tendency is often strong among them to neglect or very inadequately improve its privileges; and where there is attendance, there is so much which is uncongenial in the atmosphere of the home, that, beyond the acquisition of the simplest elements of learning, there is little progress towards that completeness of culture which American citizenship requires.[11]

In order to promote a new national unity to rival that of Prussia, and to avoid the sorry fate of what he called an "ignorant, priest ridden and emasculated France," Wilson urged that

> . . . the Bureau of Education should be strengthened, and Mr. Hoar's bill for the establishment of a system of national education, or something tantamount thereto, should receive the immediate attention of Congress and the undivided support of Republicans.[12]

In view of Wilson's notorious hatred for foreigners and Catholics,[13] and his thinly concealed thrust at parochial education, it was not surprising that some Catholic journal should come out in vigorous rebuttal of the article. This the *Catholic World* did in its issue for April, 1871. The editors of the Paulist monthly traced the roots of Wilson's "new" departure back to 1824 when, they wrote, the Republican Party

> . . . under pretext of philanthropy . . . turned abolishionist . . . unified the labor system . . . created a public debt . . . usurped for the general government the power to determine the question of suffrage and eligibility . . .

---

[11] Wilson, *art. cit.*, pp. 110 and 114.

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 120.

[13] It was with the backing of the Know-Nothings that Wilson fused his "hatred for foreigners and Catholics" with anti-slavery sentiments in "his ambition for political success in the Massachusetts election of 1854 which sent [him] to the United States Senate" [Cf. William Starr Myers, *The Republican Party. A History* (New York, 1928), p. 55].

> the power of granting charters of corporations . . . and induced it to establish a national business of agriculture and education, as if it were the only and unlimited government of the country.[14]

To the writer's way of thinking, the *Atlantic* article gave dire evidence that now the party had reached a point where it was prepared to effect

> . . . the consolidation of all the powers of the government in the general government, and the social and religious unification of the American people by a system of universal and uniform compulsory education, adopted and enforced by the authority of the united or so consolidated states, and not by the states severally.[15]

This program, predicted the *Catholic World,* would quite logically end in the "complete moulding of this population of European and African origin, Indians and Asiatics, Protestants and Catholics, Jews and pagans, into one homogeneous people after what may be called the New England Evangelical type."[16] In fact, the *World* went on, the Evangelicals and their humanitarian allies

> . . . as all their organs show, are seriously alarmed at the growth of Catholicity in the United States. . . . They wish to make education a means of preventing the growth of the Church, and unmaking the children of Catholics. . . . The aim of the New Departure, aside from certain business interest, is to suppress Catholic education gradually.[17]

The editors of the *Catholic World* concluded that although universal education in a republic was to be promoted, it was not the function of the civil authority to do so, at least to the extensive degree that

---

[14] "Unification and Education," *Catholic World,* XII (April, 1871), 2.

[15] *Ibid.*

[16] *Ibid.,* p. 7. That such sentiments were present in influential circles is clear from what Justin Morrill wrote to James G. Blaine in 1876: "[The common schools], all but universal now, and tending to become more and more so, are likely to leaven the whole lump and [make] national unity not only possible but probable. . . . Religion will tend to mold together the great majority of our people, as it is distinctively Protestant" [quoted in Sister Marie Carolyn Klinkhammer, O.P., "The Blaine Amendment of 1875: Private Motives for Political Action," *Catholic Historical Review,* XLII (April, 1956), 25]. It was felt by some that a true America could be formed only "in wiping out the French, Irish, British, German, Swedish, Italian element . . . until, through the public school, we make all comers pure Americans" ["The Parent and the State," *Journal of Education,* XXVIII (October 18, 1888), 257].

[17] "Unification and Education," p. 7.

Wilson or the Hoar federal aid plan viewed. Indeed, the writer in the Paulist journal as a Catholic challenged "the competence of the State to educate even for its own order." [18]

Catholics in the 1870's bore an animus toward tax supported schools also because, as is well known, these institutions had been for many years distinctively Protestant. This point was brought again to public notice in the autumn of 1875 by Elihu Burritt. In a letter which was published in the New York *Tribune* on October 9, Burritt, without citing instances of the violent abuse meted out to some Catholic children who, for reasons of conscience, had refused to conform to the pattern of instruction in the common schools, offered the following moderate appraisal, which was representative of the dilemma that confronted Catholics:

> . . . ninety-nine common school teachers in one hundred in all the Northern states are Protestant . . . the literature of all our reading books and the atmosphere of our schools and even their out-door sports are Protestant in their influence. . . . We ask and require [Catholics] to yield some of their scruples in sending their children to schools which are effectively Protestant and which they have considerable reason to expect will influence their young minds.

It was situations of this nature which elicited, at the request of the American hierarchy, a weighty criticism of the common school of the United States from the Congregation de Propaganda Fide, which appeared in November, 1875.[19] After informing the bishops that "the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda had been many times assured that for the Catholic children of the United States of America evils of the gravest kind are likely to result from the so-called public schools," the cardinals expressed their decided opinion that such schools were "most dangerous and very much opposed to Catholicity." This was especially true since the Church in the United States did not enjoy its rightful control over the selection of instructors, who were recruited "from every sect indiscriminately" without any precaution being taken to "stop them infusing into the young minds the seeds of evil and vice." Furthermore, "in these schools, or at least in very many of them, children of both sexes must be in the same class and class-room and must sit side by side at the same desk." The *instructio* concluded its evaluation of American public education with the general observation that "every circumstance mentioned goes to show that the children are fearfully exposed to the danger of losing their faith and that their morals are not properly safeguarded." While recognizing that "circumstances may be sometimes such as to permit parents conscientiously to send their children to the public schools," the more prudent and highly recommended course outlined by the Roman congregation was to establish "Catholic schools in every place." Bishops would be regarded as "recreant to their duty if they failed to do their very utmost to provide Catholic schools," and the program for a separate system of Catholic schools "should be especially brought to the attention of the more wealthy and influential Catholics and members of the legislature." [20]

---

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 9.

[19] "Instruction of the Congregation of Propaganda de Fide Concerning Catholic Children Attending American Public Schools," in John Tracy Ellis (Ed.), *Documents of American Catholic History* (Milwaukee, 1956), pp. 416-420.

While this uncompromising Roman document had clearly underlined the Catholic views on the dangers to religious faith present in American public schools, it had not touched upon the right of the State to establish schools, a point hotly debated by American Catholics in the nineteenth century. It was to this vexing issue that an article appearing in the *Catholic World* for January, 1880, returned to modify to some degree the narrow view proposed a decade earlier, and to anticipate by eighteen months the keystone argument in Blair's plea for national aid to the schools. The unidentified writer advanced the theory that "universal suffrage demands universal education," and that in view of this requirement, "it is both the right and the duty of the State to see that such an education is given. We say not only the right, but also the duty, for the duty of self-preservation binds the State as well as the individual." [21] But while showing a willingness to explore the degree to which the State may be justified in erecting a tax supported system of schools, the *Catholic World* warned again that the Protestant orientation of the common school offered serious dangers to Catholics, and that preachers and stump orators were often heard to declare that "the common schools would prove fatal to the Catholic Church." [22]

---

[20] *Ibid.*, pp. 417-419.

[21] "The American Side of the School Question," *Catholic World*, XXX (January, 1880), 516.

[22] "Aspects of National Education," *Catholic World*, XXXI (June, 1880), 408.

Threats to the faith of Catholic children in the common schools did not, however, proceed from their Protestant coloring alone. Under the influence of fair-minded men who opposed the use of public funds to promote any religious cause through tax maintained schools,[23] Protestantism was gradually passing from the common school, and was being replaced by what one observer called the "worst sect of all—the sect of secularism." [24] And while Catholics had rebelled at the intrusion of Protestant religious teachings and practices in the public school while their own were forbidden, the mind of many of them was adequately expressed by Bishop Bernard J. McQuaid of Rochester when he wrote that "good Protestants of any kind" were preferable to "infidels and descriers of all revelation . . . the teaching of any religion is better than none at all." [25] Hence, while Father Isaac Hecker felt justified in advising his Protestant fellow citizens to take advantage of common school education "if you prefer it," he warned that the creeping secularism of the public school posed a grave threat to all Christians:

> . . . the secular education imparted in our public schools produces men and women fitted only for those forms of worldly activity which require little or no moral discernment. The ambitious, unscrupulous adventurer is the legitimate product of such an education; and of such characters the world has never known a dearth. The want of this age is moral training; but that can never be obtained at a purely secular school.[26]

These factors, then—the question of the right of the State to educate, the presence of Protestant influence in State supported schools, and the gradual advance of secularism in these schools—were major elements in the national picture when Henry Blair launched his carefully constructed program for the establishment and temporary support of the common schools upon the tricky currents of public opinion that any significant legislation must successfully navigate. If he was aware of any ominous clouds upon the horizon that he so optimistically scanned, his public utterances of December, 1881, and June, 1882, did not betray it.

---

[23] Cf. William Kailer Dunn, *What Happened to Religious Education?* (Baltimore, 1958), pp. 129-50, 183, 300-303, 308 f.

[24] Isaac T. Hecker, "A New But False Plea for the Public Schools," *Catholic World,* XXXVI (December, 1882), 419.

[25] Quoted in Frederick J. Zwierlein, *The Life and Letters of Bishop McQuaid* (Rochester, 1926), II, 120.

[26] Isaac T. Hecker, "Catholics and Protestants Agreeing on the School Question," *Catholic World,* XXXII (February, 1881), 700 and 705.

While the Blair Bill waited in vain to be acted upon by the first session of the Forty-seventh Congress, the Boston *Journal of Education,* which was a loyal proponent of federal aid plans, set out to deal with Catholic objections to the common school. An editorial appearing in the spring of 1882 was typical of the policy of that organ toward the Church. It stated:

> . . . the authority of the Roman Catholic Church was for a thousand years supreme over the conscience, over the political, social and national life of the people of Christendom; all the work of that part of the world, all the doings of men, all the objects for which money was spent, were leavened with the Roman Catholic religion. That condition of things has passed away; but the Church will not give it up, and will not cease to strive for the restoration of the mediaeval regime.[27]

The *Journal* asserted that "modern progressive states have assumed the right of controlling public education as a means of self-preservation," with the result that "education has become a function of government, just as military and naval offices are governmental functions." [28] Throughout the summer of 1882 the Boston educational weekly discussed the charge that morality was not being taught in tax-financed schools. Expressing the opinion current among common school educators of the day, the *Journal* argued that there were "ethical principles enough held in common by all men, and there [was] sufficient agreement upon the propriety and necessity of the moral training of youth" to enable the public school to offer an ethical training which would embody "all that is essential and [offend] no honest scruples." [29] It was felt that if parents would see that the schools were staffed by men and women "with big souls and warm hearts, well cultured brains and good habits," their children would

---

[27] "The Denominational Question in the Schools," *Journal of Education,* XV (April 13, 1882), 239.

[28] W. H. Payne, "Church and School," *Journal of Education,* XVI (December 21, 1882), 388.

[29] J. Fairbanks, "Moral Instruction," *Journal of Education,* XV (May 4, 1882), 238. Cf. also R. H. Homey, "Moral Teaching in the Public School," *ibid.,* XVI (September 7, 1882), 147; "The Denominational Question in the Schools," *ibid.,* XV (April 13, 1882), 238 f.; "Two Education Reports," *Catholic World,* XLI (July, 1885), 549-544.

"grow in knowledge and goodness."[30] The very punctuality, order, industry, thrift, self-control, silence, attention, and cleanliness required of pupils in the common school promoted a reverence for "Invisible Law."[31] Catholics, while they agreed that dedicated, competent men and women were necessary for any successful school system, characterized the moral training offered in the common schools as a

> . . . mongrel morality, this code of compromises and concessions—a bit from Tom Paine, another from Jesus of Nazareth, some sentences from Benjamin Franklin, then Saul of Tarsus, something, too, from atheistic Frenchmen, all sifted and sorted by a school board nominated at a ward caucus and elected amid the turbulence of party strife.[32]

To buttress such polemics, there appeared in 1882 Thomas J. Jenkins' *The Judges of the Faith and Godless Schools.* This slender volume contained a highly inflammatory attack upon common school education which accomplished the double task of proving that the schools were both Protestant and secular. Jenkins drew upon the statements of several popes, the conciliar decrees and pastorals issued by the hierarchy of two continents, and the sermons of priests, linking each selection with the preceding by an appropriate comment.[33]

In an attempt to provide its readers with a first-hand view from a Catholic leader, the *Journal of Education* in its issue for January 18, 1883, printed an article entitled "The Other Side of the Story," by the Bishop of Rochester. McQuaid was asked to write the piece, no doubt, because he was regarded by many as "the champion of the Catholic school question."[34] He wasted no time in letting the readers of the Boston weekly know that he regarded the public school as an institution that was wasting public funds, presuming to take over parental rights in education, and placing children of all faiths in occasions of vice. Voicing his strongest charge, he declared that the common school was communistic in principle. "If the State owes its children an education at the common expense," he argued, "there is no escape from the communist tenet for food, clothes, and shelter at the common expense." In conclusion, the bishop declared that

---

[30] Fairbanks, *loc. cit.* Cf. also Amory D. Mayo, "Clerical Secularism," *Journal of Education,* XVI (July 6, 1882), 36.

[31] A. A. Miur, "Reverence for Invisible Law," *Journal of Education,* XVI (June 29, 1882), 7.

[32] Bernard J. McQuaid, "The Other Side of the Story as Told by an American," *Journal of Education,* XVII (March 15, 1883), 101.

[33] Thomas J. Jenkins, *The Judges of the Faith and Godless Schools* (New York, 1883), cited from the rulings of seventeen provincial and plenary councils, twenty-three diocesan synods, twenty-three popes, twenty-one cardinals, and seventy archbishops and bishops. Cf. also by the same author, *Christian Schools* (London, 1890), for which Cardinal Newman wrote a congratulatory letter that appears at the beginning of the book.

[34] Zwierlein, *op. cit.,* II, 146. Similar claims have been made for John J. Keane, who, as Rector of the Catholic University of America from 1887 to

> . . . the most that can be said of the American public school system is that it is an experiment of whose success so far there are many conflicting opinions. It is experimental, inasmuch as it is a radical departure from fundamental American ideas.[35]

The Boston educator, Edwin D. Meade, partly answered Bishop McQuaid's impeachment in the February 15 issue with remarks that were sure to aid the Blair cause. He defended as a "fundamental American idea" the principle that "the State should not undertake to do for the people what the people can do *better* for themselves." Yet, Meade continued, "the State is the father and the mother, the keeper of every citizen, and its responsibility extends to everything that pertains to the temporal, intellectual and moral interests of everyone."[36] And while McQuaid might accuse the State system of education of disturbing the "sacred relations of parents and children,"[37] modern political theorists could give only conditional assent to

> . . . the principle, which is urged as a universal one, that the parent has the right to do what he thinks best with his child. The parent has no monopoly of responsibility or privilege in the education of the child. . . .

1896, was often regarded by secular educators as "the representative speaker for Catholic education in this country" [Patrick Henry Ahern, *The Life of John J. Keane* (Milwaukee, 1955), p. 128]. Likewise, John Lancaster Spalding, Bishop of Peoria, has been spoken of as "the leading Catholic educator in the period between the Civil War and the World War" [Merle Curti, *The Social Ideas of American Educators* (New York, 1935), p. 348]. Nor should one overlook the prominent place of John Ireland, Archbishop of St. Paul [cf., Daniel F. Reilly, *The School Controversy, (1891-1893)*, (Washington, 1943), and James H. Moynihan, *The Life of Archbishop Ireland* (New York, 1953)].

[35] Bernard J. McQuaid, "The Other Side of the Story," *Journal of Education,* XVII (January 18, 1883), 35.

[36] Edwin D. Meade, "Bishop McQuaid's Impeachment of the Public Schools," *Journal of Education,* XVII (February 15, 1883), 99.

[37] McQuaid, "The Other Side of the Story," p. 35.

> The State has more interest in the education of the child than the parent. . . . Education in childhood and youth is for manhood; the State has almost the sole interest in the manhood of the child, hence its right to insist that the education shall be for the benefit of the State in manhood.[38]

Bishop McQuaid was given opportunity to express his views more fully, and on March 15, there appeared his second article, "The Other Side of the Story as Told by an American." After apologizing that his first contribution had disturbed the "equanimity of the cultured readers of the *Journal*," the Bishop of Rochester reiterated his charge that "the principle underlying the American common school system is essentially communistic." Then he turned to the question of religion in education. He argued that schools maintained at the public expense were not the only agencies for learning how to earn a living. Indeed, secular knowledge plus sufficient religious instruction to live a good life and attain eternal happiness were imparted in parochial schools. He excoriated what he termed the "revamping of a worn-out religion with cast off pagan shoes" which passed for ethical training in the common school. In reality, he concluded, such a compromise would satisfy only "nominal believers in a modified and emasculated Christianity." [39]

It was the Reverend Amory Dwight Mayo, noted Universalist preacher and associate editor of the *Journal*, who at this time entered the lists against Bishop McQuaid. Mayo attempted to justify the existence of the public school by recalling that the schools of the pre-national period, while they had been religious in their scope, were tax supported and had been established to train citizens for what was then a theocratic state. Similar purpose and means comprised the basis of the current public school movement; only the nature of the society had changed. The New England Universalist then presumed to expose what he regarded as the basic reason why the Bishop of Rochester and the rest of the American hierarchy stood in opposition to the common school, viz., "their religious convictions forbid them to give aid and comfort to any school which is not absolutely under their own infallible control." [40]

---

[38] Editorial, *Journal of Education,* XVII (March 8, 1883), 151 f. Cf. also "The Parent and the State," *ibid.*, XVIII (October 8, 1888), 304.

[39] Bernard J. McQuaid, "The Other Side of the Story as Told by an American," *Journal of Education,* XVII (March 15, 1883), 101.

[40] Amory D. Mayo, "Reply to Bishop McQuaid," *Journal of Education,* XVII (March 29, 1883), 195 f.

Such exchanges of views[41] did not touch upon the Blair Bill directly, although the differing philosophies they represented were crucial to the success of the New Hampshire senator's cause. But while the theorists thundered at each other, one bolt did flash from the Catholic side to strike at the very legality of the plan. Father Isaac Hecker, writing in the March, 1883, issue of the *Catholic World,* agreed with Blair and the *Journal of Education* that "illiteracy in a popular government such as ours should be, must be remedied." But the illustrious Paulist did not think that the antidote should be prepared in "disregard to the constitution of the land." It was not a wise policy, he said, "to break one's back to mend a finger." [42]

A year later, as Senator Blair brought his measure before the Senate for a second try,[43] the Catholic critics continued to play upon some of the themes they had introduced at the turn of the decade. Father James Conway, writing in the pages of the *American Catholic Quarterly Review,* while still limiting the scope of the State in educational matters, theorized that it had a definite right and duty as the defender of the personal rights of children, should these be infringed due to parental inadequacy or indifference.[44] In the following month the *Catholic World* aimed a blow at the Blair plan when it declared that two-thirds of the illiterate Negroes in the South were too old to attend common schools, and that one-half of those who could profit from such schooling were already in schools prior to 1880.[45]

From the other side, Dr. Mayo continued to pursue his nativist line by suggesting to the readers of the *Journal of Education* that the

---

[41] Two other exchanges of views were published while the Blair Bill was before Congress. Cf. M. C. O'Byrne and John J. Keane, "What is the Catholic School Policy?" *North American Review,* CXL (June, 1885), 521-535, and *The Public Schools and the Catholic Clergy: A Candid Statement of the Situation: Correspondence between D. L. Kiehle, Superintendent of Public Instruction in Minnesota, and James McGolrick, Bishop of Duluth* (St. Paul, 1890).

[42] Isaac T. Hecker, "The Impending Issue of the School Question," *Catholic World,* XXXVI (March, 1883), 850.

[43] The bill was introduced on December 3, 1883 [*Congressional Record,* 48th Cong., 1st Sess., 1884, XIV, 36]. The senators debated from March 18, 1884, until April 7 [*ibid.,* pp. 1999-2724] when the bill was passed 33-11-32 [*ibid.,* p. 2724].

[44] James Conway, "The Rights and Duties of the Family and the State in Regard to Education," *American Catholic Quarterly Review,* IX (January, 1884), 115-120.

[45] J. F. Slattery, "Some Aspects of the Negro Problem," *Catholic World,* XXXVIII (February, 1884), 612.

"people of the United States do not propose to add to the mighty obligations of the clergy the additional charge of public instruction." [46] Since American churches taken together boasted a combined membership of fifty million souls with church sittings for only twenty million, he felt constrained to conclude that "the church of every community has a field of operation so broad and exacting that it may well limit its efforts to what it can never half include." [47] Mayo was again referring chiefly to Catholic bishops and priests who, in his judgment, had no place in the American educational picture since they were under "implicit orders from an Italian Pontiff . . . to destroy the most vital institution of this Republic." [48] The American people, in his opinion,

> . . . have seen that every system of education managed by ecclesiastics, as well as every system dependent upon private enterprise, has finally broken down and failed to educate the masses of any land. . . . No priesthood ever succeeded in educating the people. Every Christian nation, after a fair trial, has taken popular education out of the hands of a priesthood and lodged its supervision in the government that represents the whole body politic.[49]

The closing months of 1884, a year which saw the Blair Bill passed for the first time by the Senate,[50] but ignored in the House,[51] brought to Baltimore the members of the Catholic hierarchy, who gathered at St. Mary's Seminary in the Third Plenary Council of the American Church. The serious criticisms of the common school voiced in the Roman *instructio* of 1875 were here applied in appropriate law to American Catholics, though the decrees on education drawn up by the fathers of the council were more restrained and judicious in their expression. Title Six, one of the two sections devoted to the schools, instructed Catholics that the spirit of the world was at war with the Church. Men having a totally secular viewpoint were attempting to wrest from the Church its duty of teaching Catholic youth and to hand the task over to laicized governments.[52] The result was an a-religious, one-sided education, able to develop only "one side of life," and, the bishops warned, "such a life will surely topple over" along with "every social system built up of such lives." [53] In order to insure the welfare of the nation, and, above all, to preserve the precious gift of the Catholic faith, the council decreed that "near every church where it does not already exist, a parochial school is to be erected within two years from the promulgation of this Council," and the priest who failed to do so through grave negligence was to be "removed from that church." The bishops were careful to state that the priest did not bear this serious responsibility alone, but that all the faithful, even those who did not have children of school age, were to be informed through pastoral letters, sermons, and even private conversations, that their neglect to co-operate would be a serious omission. Children could be permitted to attend the common school only if their parents provided sufficiently and fully for their Christian education, or on account of a reason accepted by the bishop. The prelates debated at some length the feasibility of denying the Sacrament of Penance to parents who contumaciously sent their children to the common school, but this provision, which had been recommended in the instruction of 1875, was finally rejected.[54]

---

[46] Amory D. Mayo, "The Ecclesiastical View," *Journal of Education,* XIX (March 6, 1884), 148.

[47] Amory D. Mayo, *Building for the Children in the South* (Washington, 1884), p. 3.

[48] Editorial, *Journal of Education,* XX (July 17, 1884), 72.

[49] Amory D. Mayo, "The American Side of the Story," *Journal of Education,* XVII (February 8, 1883), 83.

[50] *Congressional Record,* 48th Cong., 1st Sess., 1884, XV, 2724.

[51] "Three months this bill was pending in the House of Representatives before adjournment, after it had passed the Senate, and the objection of one single man defeated it" [Senator Harrison H. Riddleberger of Virginia, quoted in *ibid.,* 49th Cong., 1st Sess., 1886, XVII, 1606]. The "one single man" referred to might possibly have been the domineering Speaker of the House, John G. Carlisle. He looked upon the Blair Bill as an attempt to drain the treasury and thus provide an excuse for maintaining the protective tariff [Going, *art. cit.,* p. 282]. Carlisle explicitly refused to call the bill up for consideration [James Anderson Barnes, *John G. Carlisle, Financial Statesman* (New York, 1931), pp. 46, 51, and 137]. Indeed, two of the most prominent figures in the political, humanitarian, and educational undertakings of these years, Robert G. Winthrop and Jabez Lamar Monroe Curry, were of the opinion that

---

"the death of the measure will always lie at the door of Carlisle" and his associate, Samuel J. Randall of Pennsylvania, Chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Jessie Pearle Rice, *J. L. M. Curry, Southerner, Statesman and Educator* (New York, 1949), p. 154].

[52] Francis P. Cassidy, "Catholic Education in the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore," *Catholic Historical Review,* XXXIV (October, 1948), 292.

[53] Quoted from the pastoral letter of 1884 in Peter Guilday (Ed.), *The National Pastorals of the American Hierarchy* (Washington, 1923), p. 244.

[54] Cassidy, *art. cit.,* pp. 294 f. and 416.

After the close of the council, in jarring contrast to the glowing appraisal of James Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore, to Cardinal Simeoni, Prefect of Propaganda, that "it is evident that everyone in our free America appreciates the important influence of the Catholic Church for the grandeur and prosperity of the nation," [55] the *Journal of Education* in May, 1885, again questioned the ability and loyalty of teachers in Catholic schools because they must "first receive orders from an infallible ecclesiastical corporation." [56] And after papal approval was given to the work of the council in September of that year, the *Journal* commented that its decrees on education

> . . . will hinder the true Americanization of our people, will perpetuate odious religious bigotry, and will reward thousands of youth, imperfectly trained in parish schools, with back seats in practical life . . . will either send every Catholic parish into financial bankruptcy or let loose a multitude of ignorant youth to plague the State.[57]

In the late spring of 1886, his bill having passed the Senate for the second time[58] only to be replaced in the House by another measure, due to the maneuvering of "packed committees," [59] Senator

---

[55] Gibbons to Simeoni, Baltimore, December 27, 1884, quoted in John Tracy Ellis, *The Life of James Cardinal Gibbons* (Milwaukee, 1952), I, 251.

[56] "Msgr. Capel, Come Again," *Journal of Education,* XXI (May 5, 1885), 297. Henry Blair expressed his doubts about Catholic loyalty when he said that "this country will not be given over to those who would teach a civil allegiance elsewhere than within our borders . . . a subsidiary civil allegiance only to the United States. . . . I speak of but a fraction of a great body of our citizens; for the masses of that same body of American citizens are true to the flag and do not propose to elect a President who resides on the banks of the Tiber" [quoted in New York *Freeman's Journal,* February 22, 1890].

[57] *Journal of Education,* XXIII (November 19, 1885), 336. A. D. Mayo supported such remarks with references to the financial difficulties which had recently beset the Archdiocese of Cincinnati and St. Mary's Parish in Lawrence, Massachusetts [cf. "The American Side of the Story," p. 83]. For an account of the trouble in Cincinnati, cf. John H. Lamott, *History of the Archdiocese of Cincinnati* (New York, 1921), pp. 189-207. The story of the financial problems in Lowell, Massachusetts, is told by Robert H. Lord, *et al, History of the Archdiocese of Boston* (New York, 1944) III, 298-301.

[58] The bill had been introduced on December 8, 1885 [*Congressional Record,* 49th Cong., 1st Sess., 1886, XVII, 130] and had been debated from January 7 to March 5, 1886, [*ibid.,* pp. 501-2105], passing on the final day of debate 36-11-29, whence it was sent to the House [*ibid.,* p. 2105].

[59] Blair used this expression two years later as he reviewed the treatment given the bill by the House of Representatives in 1886 [*ibid.,* 50th Cong., 1st

Blair addressed an irate but respectful letter to Michael A. Corrigan, Archbishop of New York. "The bill has been opposed here," he wrote, "with quiet but vigorous efforts by certain leading men and influences in the Church." He asked the archbishop to create what favor he could for the measure so that general Catholic acceptance would insure the victory of federal aid. Blair predicted that such a move on the part of Catholic leaders would turn "the hearts of many millions now full of prejudice and opposition . . . warmly and trustfully to your communion."[60] With no such support coming during the ensuing months, Blair, in winding up his side of the debate before the first session of the Fiftieth Congress in 1888, rose on February 15 to expose to his colleagues the disastrous effects that the machinations of "that large body of our fellow citizens who disbelieve in the common school" had wrought on his plan in the House. Recalling for the senators the debates over the Blaine Amend-

---

Sess., 1888, XIX, 1218]. The history of the bill in the House can be outlined as follows: after being sent to the House, the bill was steered into the Committee on Labor by its sponsor, Albert Shelby Willis of Kentucky, since the Committee on Education were overwhelmingly opposed to the measure even though the membership of the House seemed generally friendly to the bill [Going, *art. cit.*, p. 282]. However, during a special meeting of the Labor Committee, held at 5 P.M. on April 26, 1886, William Henry Crain of Texas was successful in having the Blair wording struck out after the "be it enacted" clause by a vote of 10-3 ["Minutes, Committee on Labor," House of Representatives, 49th Cong., 1st Sess., 1888, National Archives, Washington, D. C.].

[60] Quoted in Henry William Blair, *Address Delivered at the American Federation of Labor Convention, at Philadelphia, Pa., 1892* (New York, n. d.), pp. 7-8. Two years later Blair stated his opinion that the opposition of the Church to his bill was of "so inveterate and influential a character that it has done more than any other cause . . . to endanger its enactment into law" [*Congressional Record,* 51st Cong., 1st Sess., 1890, XXI, 1542]. Blair felt that certain "prominent members of committees" had been intimidated by "threats . . . of the anathemas of the Church to be visited upon them and their children" [*ibid.,* 50th Cong., 1st Sess., 1888, XIX, 1218]. Representative Crain appears to be the only possible link between House committees and the Church. He had been educated by the Christian Brothers in one of their New York schools, and had graduated from the Jesuits' St. Francis Xavier College in 1867, and would later be buried in Hillside Catholic Cemetery, Cuero, in DeWitt County, Texas [Walter Prescott Webb, *The Handbook of Texans* (Austin, 1952), I, 431]. Of the thirty-two committeemen in the House who dealt with the bill, Crain seems to be the only one with a background of Catholic education, although nine had attended private schools and academies [cf., *Biographical Dictionary of the American Congress, 1774-1927* (Washington, 1950)].

ment of a decade earlier, Blair revealed that "a friend of mine pointed out to me upon that floor nine Jesuits who were there logrolling against that proposed amendment to the Constitution." A similar Jesuit pressure, he said, had been brought against his own bill. He had seen with his own eyes the letter of a Jesuit priest to a member of "packed committees of the House of Representatives" which urged the member in question "to oppose the bill and kill it." [61]

Such reprehensible activity, continued the Senator from New Hampshire, was not limited only to the halls of Congress. The Society of Jesus was "organized all over the country for its [the bill] destruction." The sinister motive behind it all was quite clear to the New England crusader. Having been "repudiated by every free country, Catholic and Protestant, in the Old World," the Black Legion "had come to our borders . . . to secure the control of this continent by destroying the public school system of America," and the Jesuits would one day be regarded as "more the enemy of this country than the antichrist is today." [62] Unfortunately, the Jesuits had thus far succeeded in enlisting the support of a respectable element in the country. Blair was of the opinion that the New York *Evening Post,* the Boston *Herald* and the Washington *Post,* because of their consistently adverse editorial policies, were in reality "organs of Jesuitism," and the *Herald,* along with the Boston *Advertiser,* the New York *Times,* and the Chicago *Tribune,* all papers which had formerly favored the bill, opposed it because "upon the staff of every great paper in this country today there is a Jesuit, and the business of that man is to see that a blow is struck whenever there is an opportunity to strike at the common school system of America." [63]

Blair hastened to point out to his Senate colleagues that he regarded most Catholics and their leaders as loyal Americans. In fact, he had a warm regard for the memory of the founder of the American hierarchy, John Carroll, who, he said, was a churchman "devoted to civil rights and to true religion." On the other hand, he felt a deep bitterness for the newspapers which had sold out to less idealistic churchmen. Carried away by the emotion of the moment, Blair threatened to have the press gallery of the Senate cleared if adequate and fair coverage were not forthcoming for his bill.[64] Two days later the Washington *Post* reacted to Blair's remarks with the comment that they were "the most foolish ever made" in the Senate,[65] while the Chicago *Tribune* announced that so far as its editors were concerned, "the Jesuits must be acquitted of all blame or responsibility" for the policy of that paper toward Blair's "anti-self help bill."[66] The Louisville *Courier-Journal* admitted that Jesuits might possibly be found on its premises—among the printers' devils—and they suggested a senatorial investigation.[67] The bill, however, passed.[68]

---

[61] *Congressional Record,* 50th Cong., 1st Sess., 1888, XIX, 1217-1221.

[62] *Ibid.,* p. 1218. Blair's remarks about the Jesuits seem directly inspired by such pamphlets as George P. Clifford's *Our Republic in Danger—A Clarion Charge to the Rescue* which had appeared in 1883 [cf. Gustavus Myers, *History of Bigotry in the United States* (New York, 1943), pp. 219-230], and Justin D. Fulton's *Washington in the Lap of Rome* (Boston, 1888), which warned Americans that Cardinal Gibbons was masterminding a papal plot against the public school system [cf. Higham, *op. cit.,* pp. 60, 62, and 83-87].

[63] *Congressional Record,* 50th Cong., 1st Sess., 1888, XIX, 1218.

Four months later, John Gilmary Shea came out in the *American Catholic Quarterly Review* with the most notable Catholic critique of the Blair Bill that was to appear. Shea labelled the proposal "not only in its spirit, but in its form . . . un-American and indefensible." He charged that it struck at "every principle of sound government," by creating hordes of offices, thus preparing the way for an army of "sychophants and time servers" who would be needed for its administration. He challenged the very constitutionality of the proposal by opposing Blair's understanding of the general welfare clause with that of Jefferson which viewed the words "not as a grant of power, but as a limitation on the ability to tax." Also to be questioned, thought Shea, were the statistics pretending to offer a picture of national illiteracy.[69]

---

[64] Cf. John Gilmary Shea, "Federal Schemes to Aid Common Schools in the Southern States," *American Catholic Quarterly Review,* XIII (April, 1888), who states that although Blair's outburst was suppressed in the *Congressional Record,* it was not forgotten by the reporters in the gallery [p. 356]. Blair made similar but more restrained charges of prejudicial newspaper coverage in 1890 [cf. *Congressional Record,* 51st Cong., 1st Sess., 1890, XXI, 1397 and 2005].

[65] Washington *Post,* February 17, 1888.

[66] Chicago *Tribune,* February 17, 1888. The New York *Times,* once the only New York daily to favor the bill, had broken with Republican causes generally after the nomination of James G. Blaine [cf. Samuel Eliot Morison and Henry Steele Commager, *The Growth of the American Republic* (New York, 1950), II, 225].

[67] Louisville *Courier-Journal, February* 22, 1888.

[68] The bill had been introduced on December 12, 1887 [*Congressional Record,* 50th Cong., 1st Sess., 1888, XIX, 21], had been debated from December 12, 1887 until February 15, 1888 [*ibid.,* pp. 121-1212], and had been passed on the last day of debate 39-29-8 [*ibid.,* p. 1223]. The *Post* announced its passage with the headline, "It Passes the Senate—The Blair Bill Now Goes to the House for Defeat" [February 16, 1888]. The confidence in the *Post's* statement was not unfounded, as Representative Willis had not been returned to the House, and his place had been taken by Representative Crain, who was also chairman of the sub-committee to which the Blair measure would be entrusted [*ibid.,* February 18, 1888].

Turning his attention to religious considerations, the fiery editor expressed impatience over the tendency among non-Catholic writers to characterize Catholic schools as "sectarian" thus shading this innocent word with an odious implication. Senator Blair's misinformation about the Jesuits was next mercilessly exposed as Shea gleefully pointed out that Archbishop Carroll had been a Jesuit prior to the suppression of the Society of Jesus in 1773, and, together with his cousin, Charles, had been educated by the Jesuits and had co-founded a Jesuit college at Georgetown. Referring to Blair's remark about the Jesuits who were seen "logrolling" against the Blaine Amendment, Shea said that the members of the Society stationed in Washington were better known there than Senator Blair, and that if "even three of them" had been on the floor of the House "acting as logrollers," the event would have been "heralded through the country," and the nation would have been given their "names, pictures, and the full story of the affair." Then, pointedly returning to the main issue, the editor of the *Review* reminded his readers that the Society of Jesus had little interest in the elementary schooling of Catholics. If Blair were sincere in his dread of the Catholic Church, reasoned Shea, he should have denounced the bishops, the teaching sisters and brothers, and the parish priests.[70] Finally, John Gilmary Shea attempted to dig beneath the voicing of humanitarian ideals so often associated with the Blair plan[71] to lay bare what he regarded as the real guiding interest. He quoted from some remarks the senator had uttered while the naval appropriations bill was under debate in the Senate in which he had argued that northern business was threatened by cheap, uneducated labor in the South, and that if the standard of this southern labor were not raised through education, the markets of the North would gradually lose out. Shea concluded, as the *Catholic World* had done seventeen years earlier, that regional business interests played a great role in the formulation of Republican educational programs.[72]

---

[69] Shea, *art. cit.*, pp. 348 ff.

[70] *Ibid.*, p. 352.

[71] *Congressional Record*, 49th Cong., 1st Sess., 1887, XVIII, 2526 f. This speech was later reprinted under the title, "Education and Labor—Competition between the North and the South—National Aid to Education Alone Is Protection to Labor and Capital," in Henry William Blair, *The Education Bill* (New York, 1887), pp. 50-52.

While Catholics continued to express their ideological objections to the common school in general,[73] and, at times, to the Blair Bill in particular,[74] a new factor entered the scene. Through the weary decade that the bill had been argued in the Senate and ignored in the House, the idea of public education had gained popularity in the South, and much evidence was at hand to indicate that the rising tide of southern enthusiasm for tax supported schools was effectively sweeping away the very foundations Blair had for his measure.[75] Aware that such dangerous currents threatened to swamp his legislative craft, the senator rose on February 21, 1890, to inform his colleagues of the Fiftieth Congress that his bill was still very necessary. He maintained that

---

[72] Shea, *art. cit.*, p. 352.

[73] One Catholic writer presented a view of the controversy that was to be echoed later by Senator Blair in his final attempt to have the bill approved by the Senate: "Two movements are already initiated: the parochial school movement and the statutory school movement, the former a right patent in all our traditions and laws, the latter an attempt to bring all institutions of education . . . under statutory control . . . the reversal of traditional and apparently constitutional rights" [August D. Small, "Send the Whole Boy to School," *Catholic World*, XVII (August, 1888), 591].

[74] Cf. *Freeman's Journal*, March 3, 1888, which praised the Atlanta *Constitution* for its stand against the Blair Bill as an attempt to degrade an independent South.

[75] "A subtle and contagious energy in the idea of universal education [is] . . . being slowly communicated through the South, rousing its apathetic lethargy to new life" [John J. Ingalls, "National Aid to Common Schools," *Nation*, CXLII (April, 1886), 383]. The Washington *Post* described how enthusiasm for the Blair plan was flagging due to the "confidence of the people of the South in their ability to provide for their citizens in the matter of education" [February 27, 1886]. Blair suffered a personal blow when he failed to win a favorable response in his own state legislature after speaking there on behalf of his measure in the summer of 1887 [Chicago *Tribune*, February 17, 1888]. Cf. also the Louisville *Courier-Journal*, February 27, 1886 and Lee, *op. cit.*, p. 95. For evidence of growth in the number of schools and pupils attending them in the South cf. Washington *Post*, February 25, 1886; "A Bill to Promote Mendicancy," *Nation*, CXLII (February, 1886), 143; "Impressive Warning," *ibid.*, CXLII (March, 1886), 184; "Ten Years' Growth of the Public School,"

> . . . two great institutions in our society undertake to control the education of the child. The public school system undertakes to give universal education . . . which shall insure absolute freedom of action to the individual in all the affairs of public and private life. . . . The other great system of education [the parochial school] . . . gives religious training primarily, and inculcates the idea of church authority as that which must guide the individual.[76]

To Blair's mind the issue was clearly and crucially drawn: "One is freedom, the other slavery. The one not only permits, but insures the perpetuation of the Republic, the other destroys it." Recalling some of the strictures he had laid against the Jesuits in 1886, Blair continued his speech with the alarming intelligence that members of the Society had "infested every American city and hamlet," especially in the North where the public school system was "threatened and in many places already controlled by Jesuitical craft and power." He rationalized that the forces of Rome were "threatened by the education bill, which, if it becomes a law, will settle the great controversy between the public and parochial or church school forever in favor of the former." In a manner strikingly similar to the proponents of the New Departure, who twenty years earlier had urged the passage of the Hoar federal aid proposal or something "tantamount thereto," Blair indicated that the crucial area of engagement was to be the South. According to his analysis,

> . . . if the South can once be brought under the influence of the system of free public schools—there will be an end of this struggle for the possession of the American child on the part of these outcast European Jesuits. . . . The twenty-five million people who inhabit the southern states are naturally a more religious people than the people of the North. They

---

Journal of Education, XXVIII (October 4, 1888), 143. Later observers, however, have written that these "heroic efforts at readjustment" were in reality only the germination of an educational movement which did not take firm root until the close of the century, and did not flower for another twenty-five years [Knight, *op. cit.,* pp. 415 ff.]. The southern senators who abandoned the Blair cause have been accused of retarding the "educational development of the South seriously for two generations" [quoted from J. L. M. Curry in Alderman and Gordon, *op. cit.,* p. 332].

[76] *Congressional Record,* 51st Cong., 1st Sess., 1890, XXI, 1534.

are Protestants and liberal, and are free from the vast influx of immigration which has overflown and transformed the Northern states.

Henry Blair was triumphantly sure that

> . . . if the children of the twenty-five million of our southern countrymen can once be trained in the public schools they will maintain the system against all comers, and we shall find the South the great bulwark of free institutions in all coming time.

It was not enough to observe and applaud the painful advance of public education in the South, concluded Senator Blair. The victory of American nationalism demanded immediate action by the Senate such as his bill proposed.[77]

Several senators felt constrained to make remarks in defense of Catholic schools,[78] and the papers once again had a field day commenting upon Blair's oratorical excesses. Recalling his earlier definition of a "Jesuit" as anyone who favored denominational schools over public schools,[79] the *Courier-Journal* of Louisville claimed that the senator himself had "more than all other causes combined . . . retarded the extension of our common school system," which was by nature a system of schools erected through community zeal stimulated by a first-hand knowledge of local needs and supported by local taxation. The paper declared that "Senator Blair is himself a Jesuit." [80] Both the Chicago *Tribune* and the *Catholic Mirror* of Baltimore attributed Blair's wild charges to the "excitement growing out of disappointment," and they were hopeful that when he returned to "his sober senses," he would regret his words.[81] The *Mirror* was particularly incisive when it stated that

> . . . Mr. Blair has been forced to recognize that the influence of the Jesuits, whom he especially dreads, after all constitutes but a very feeble element, relatively speaking, in the vast popular opposition to the unconstitutional measure which is so close to his heart.[82]

---

[77] *Ibid.*, pp. 1542-1545.

[78] *Ibid.*, p. 2692.

[79] *Ibid.*, p. 1542.

[80] February 16, 1888.

[81] February 16, 1888.

[82] March 8, 1890. The *Alta California* was cited as having stated that the accusation of opposing the Blair Bill was "the first good thing that has been said for the Jesuits this year."

On March 20, 1890, the members of the Senate gathered to vote for the fourth time upon the Blair proposal.[83] The bill was expected to pass by a small margin, and the New Hampshire senator kept a private tally as the votes were cast. At the conclusion of the voting, his colleagues were startled when he leaped from his chair, "perfectly white with excitement," and strode into the main aisle of the chamber dramatically demanding to be heard. His private scoring had shown him that the bill was three votes shy of victory.[84] He changed his ballot to "nay" and then obtained the floor again to enter a motion to reconsider, which was accepted.[85] The opponents of the measure realized that a counter-move would secure the first, and, very likely, the decisive Senate rejection of the bill, and Senator John J. Ingalls of Kansas obtained the floor to move that the motion to reconsider be tabled, which was also accepted. Since Ingalls was not inclined to push for reconsideration, but preferred to let the proponents of the tariff and federal elections bills get on with their business, the session closed with the Blair proposal finally defeated.[86] As the *Catholic Mirror* commented, "Blair blared, but the country was deaf."[87] It was bitter irony for the senator that during the weeks leading up to the fatal vote in the Senate, the House had revamped its rules in such a way that passage of his measure in that body was assured once it cleared the Senate.[88]

A year later Henry Blair's term expired. That he did not immediately give up his conviction that the Catholic Church erected hurdles that any federal aid plan for schools must surmount, became clear in 1892 when he addressed the convention of the American Federation of Labor which met from December 12 to 17 in Philadelphia.[89] Alluding to the "Fourteen Points" on the Catholic school issue submitted to the American hierarchy on the previous November 17 by Archbishop Francesco Satolli, the papal ablegate,[90] Blair remarked that the "leading prelates of the Catholic Church in the United States, understood to be approved and probably inspired by the Pope himself," had apparently withdrawn opposition to the common school system. He felt certain that a friendlier Catholic attitude toward the public school had developed, and that his education bill could easily pass any Congress that might introduce it. Unaware of the irony in his words, the former Senator from New Hampshire now looked forward to an age when "bigotry, ignorance and superstition" would vanish from the American scene before the shining "pure and holy light of that higher physical, moral, intellectual and spiritual development of human nature" foretold by the prophets of old and to be brought into realization by common school education. Blair invited his Catholic fellow citizens to "advance to the very front of the free and liberal tendencies of the times" and to use the immense power of their Church to take what he termed "a leading, if not the leading part, in the universal establishment and general support of the common school." [91]

---

[83] *Congressional Record,* 51st Cong., 1st Sess., 1890, XXI, 2485.

[84] New Orleans *Picayune,* March 21, 1890. However, the count, after Blair had changed his vote to "nay" was 31-37-14 [*Congressional Record,* 51st Cong., 1st Sess., 1890, XXI, 2491]. Blair later recalled that his bill had been defeated through the "unexpected defection of two of the supposed supporters whose votes with that of the Vice-President would have given the bill its third reading and passage" [Blair, *Address,* p. 6]. An important fiscal speech which dwelt briefly but impressively on the monetary extravagances inherent in the Blair plan was delivered just prior to the vote by Senator Joseph Hawley of Connecticut [cf. *Congressional Record,* p. 2490]. Blair blamed this speech for turning the vote against his measure [Blair, *Address,* p. 6].

[85] *Congressional Record,* p. 2491.

[86] *Ibid.,* pp. 2537 and 2722.

[87] March 8, 1890.

[88] New Orleans *Picayune,* February 10, 12, 13, and 15, 1890 and Louisville *Courier-Journal,* February 7, 1890.

From the foregoing it is evident that during the decade in which the Blair education bill was argued in Congress, fear and suspicion characterized the Catholic attitude toward the common school. The fear was founded validly upon the fact of a militant Protestantism exerting its influence through tax supported schools, as well as upon the dread that the growing secularism of those institutions would infect the faith of Catholic children attending them, and thus weaken the life of the Church in the United States. To these reasonable claims were added sometimes exaggerated suspicions, based for the most part on European experiences, that the public school was being directly engineered to subvert Catholic belief in the new world. The fact that Catholics differed, often bitterly, among themselves regarding the right of the State to intervene in education and regarding the limits to be assigned to its activity, served only to intensify their often frantic anxiety. Against this background, the Blair Bill could easily have been construed as a formidable offensive against the Church. It is significant that Catholics opposed the measure ideologically only on the issues of constitutionality and paternalism that it broached, and limited their other objections to questions of practicability.

---

[89] *American Federation of Labor, History, Encyclopedia, Reference Book* (Washington, 1924), II, 336.

[90] Reilly, *op. cit.*, pp. 208 and 271-76.

[91] Blair, *Address*, pp. 7 and 8.

In his attitude toward the Catholic animosity to his proposal, Senator Blair, rather than reflecting the general antagonistic distrust for the Catholic hierarchy which was the hallmark of late nineteenth-century nativism, seemed rather to be enamoured with the anti-Jesuistism fostered by the A. P. A. It is unfortunate for his memory as a truly liberal legislator that he did not take pains to make himself aware of the currents of thought rising among American Catholics which were in accord with the philosophy that underlay his plan. The fact that the Senate defeated his bill on constitutional and fiscal grounds, and that the House rejected it on sectional issues proved especially damaging to his opinion that the Church was the supreme foe of his measure. But while Blair, because of his prejudices, must be regarded as another victim child of his era, his significance as one of the earliest and most prominent proponents of extensive federal spending for far reaching governmental programs, and his crusade in the cause of government aid to the schools, should assure him a notable mention in the constitutional and social history of the American people, and an honored niche in the hall of fame populated by later, and more successful, politicians of his particular humanitarian persuasion.

Cathedral High School
Duluth

THE PARMA LETTERS AND THE DANGERS TO CARDINAL POLE

By

George B. Parks*

Nearly a century ago, in March, 1865, a copy was made of a collection of letters of Cardinal Pole in the Archivio di Stato at Parma for Sir John Dalberg Acton, the reason being, as the inscription on the folder says when translated, that Sir John "is preparing for publication a large collection of the letters of Cardinal Pole." Abandoned like many other of Lord Acton's ambitious enterprises, this great task is still to be done. Meantime Pastor used the Parma letters in his *History of the Popes,* but when Cardinal Pole's latest biographer tried after the last war to obtain access to the letters, he was unable to find out about them.[1] Thanks now to the help of Dr. Gino Corti of the University of Florence and to a grant from the American Philosophical Society, I am able to report on them.

The reason for the presence of the letters at Parma is doubtless the fact that they were for the most part addressed to Alessandro Cardinal Farnese, whose father Pierluigi became (in 1545) the first, and whose brother Ottavio the second, Duke of Parma in the dynasty which lasted into the eighteenth century. Since the cardinal was only seventeen years of age in 1537 when the letters begin, I had hoped that they might have personal overtones. In fact, they are for the most part official and written in a purely adult tone. None the less, the humanity of Cardinal Pole shines through many of them, as it did through so much of what he wrote, and may justify this reminder of him as well as aid a future editor. They also throw new light on the dangers to which the cardinal was exposed by the wrath of his cousin, Henry VIII, and which are discussed in the second part of this article.

The thirty-two letters, Raccolta Manuscritti 135 in the Archivio, were written between 1537 and 1557, all in Italian, all but one in the hand of a secretary but with autograph signature—usually "Humil*limus* *Servi*tor Reg. card*ina*lis polus"—and sometimes with autograph postscripts in Italian or Latin; one letter is entirely autograph.

---

* Mr. Parks is professor of English in Queens College, Flushing, New York.

[1] Wilhelm Schenk, *Reginald Pole* (London, 1950), p. 171.

I present a calendar of the letters in chronological rearrangement, the numbering being that in pencil in the Archivio.

I. THE JOURNEY TO THE LOW COUNTRIES AS LEGATE TO ENGLAND, 1537-1538

21. From Piacenza, March 4, 1537, to Protonotary Ricalcato, papal secretary in Rome. Reports his slow journey (for reasons of health and for impediments), having sent his last letter from Bologna. He was received at Piacenza with "molta humanità et hilarità d'animo" by the vice-legate there. 1 page

1. From Chieri, March 9, 1537, to the Bishop-elect of Algiers, papal secretary. Reports hospitable reception at Asti yesterday, at Chieri, and tomorrow at Turin. Signed: Vti frater R. card. polus Ang^{s}. leg^{s}. 16 lines

[These two letters add some cheerful details to Pole's report of his journey in the hitherto published letters to Cardinal Contarini from Bologna, February 28 [*Poli Epistolae,* edited by A. M. Querini, 5 vols., (Brescia, 1744-1757), II, 20] and from Piacenza (*ibid.,* II, 23; now to be dated March 4 also) and from Lyon on March 24 (*ibid.,* II, 28)].

2. From Cambrai, May 7, 1537, to Monsignore Ambrosio. Last wrote from Paris on April 11; has just received letters of March 12 and April 5, the first received from Rome since he reached France. He sends in duplicate an account of his treatment by the queen regent [who would not receive him at the court in Brussels]; his hope is in God. If he is to be recalled for the council [of Vicenza], "per Francia no*n* penso che possa, ne debba andare." He blames the Count [Cifuentes] and Dr. Ortiz, Spanish agents in Rome, for the obstruction of his mission to Brussels and England. 3½ pages

[I believe that the report, for which this is the covering letter, has not been published; it may be among the legatine reports; Pole's letter to the pope of May 18 is a general statement of events to date (*Poli Epistolae,* II xix, 46-57); numerous other letters on this mission have been published (*ibid.,* II, 19-89, summarized in *Letters and Papers of Henry the Eighth,* XII, i and ii).]

II. THE JOURNEY AS LEGATE TO THE EMPEROR AND THE KING OF FRANCE, 1539

3. From Carpentras, May 12, 1539, to Cardinal Farnese. Refuses to be discouraged by the many obstacles to his "santa et necessaria Impresa" (to persuade the emperor and the King of France to combine against the schismatic Henry), and hopes to do well in this place convenient to both monarchs; his return to Rome now would discourage the faithful in England. 2 pages

[Pole wrote the same day to Cardinal Contarini (*Poli Epistolae*, II, 153-155)].

4. From Carpentras, May 24, 1539, to the same. He is not hopeful of his mission since the King of France does not wish to see him. He will do whatever the pope says "senza hauer alcun minimo rispetto a fatica o pericolo mio proprio." 3 pages

5. From Carpentras, June 12, 1539, to the Bishop of Algiers. He agrees with Cardinal Farnese, now on the way to the Spanish court, that there is no need to send a cardinal to the King of France until the emperor's intent is known. An autograph postscript adds seven lines of comment on a letter just received. 3 pages, plus 7 lines

6. From Carpentras, August 28, 1539, to Cardinal Farnese. He has sent the Abbot Parpaglia to Rome to give reasons why Pole should stay in Avignon. 1 page, plus autograph postscript in Latin, thirteen lines, commenting on a letter just received from Farnese and on the dread news of a Turkish victory.

An unnumbered sheet lists the disbursements of the legate to August 28 and September 17: total, 48,827 crowns.

7. From Carpentras, September 23, 1539, to the same. He has been ordered by the pope to return, and will do so in two or three days, "usando quella diligentia ch'io potro migliore, per guardarmi dalle insidie che mi potriano essere fatte, et mi sono tutto'l di minacciati." ½ page (14 lines)

[These letters supplement those to Cardinal Contarini on Pole's fruitless mission to Toledo. The other letters are in *Poli Epistolae*, II, 142, ff. calendared in *Letters and Papers*, XIV, i and ii; some of these are to Farnese also.]

8. From Verona, October 25, 1539, to the same. Though he has had the pope's leave to stay until Christmas, he is now informed by

the papal *maestro di casa* that he ought to return; he begs Farnese to see if he may not stay notwithstanding, where he has found "sicurta della vita della quale molto sono insidiato." 1 page, plus 2 lines

[Pole had returned to Rome by November, where he wrote Epistola, II, lix, pp. 136-139.]

III. PERSONAL

23. From Capranica [, south of Rome,] July 28, 1541, to Signora Constanza Fregoso. He acknowledges the bequest of a ring from her brother the late cardinal, sent to him by the Marchesa of Pescara (Vittoria Colonna). Pole begs his correspondent to "succeder in loco del . . . fratello tenendomi in loco di figliolo." ½ page (13 lines) [In this summer in which Pole had endured the grief of his mother's execution by order of Henry VIII, he had already turned for consolation to Vittoria Colonna as to a second mother; he makes the same touching gesture here].

24. From Viterbo, December 12, 1541, to Cardinal Farnese. He sends a copy of his report to His Excellency on the occurrences here, and on what should be done to give the sheep a shepherd.
⅓ page (9 lines)

IV. LEGATE TO THE COUNCIL OF TRENT, 1542

9. From Viterbo, October 19, 1542, to the same. He announces his appointment by the pope as a legate to the council; he leaves for Rome at once. The news had been sent on by Flaminio the poet, one of Pole's *familia* at Viterbo, to Civita Vecchia, where the cardinal had gone to welcome the pope returning from his summer residence.
⅓ page (10 lines)

10. From Viterbo, November 1, 1542, to the same. The three legates to Trent are to go separately to Rovere, one-half day's journey short of Trent; to go "in habito caualcaresco" [as laymen, I assume], avoiding Siena, Bologna, Mantua, and Verona, though having to go through Florence. Cardinal Morone left Viterbo on Sunday after dinner, and yesterday morning left Ponsi. Pole leaves today, but after dinner since it is a holy day. A postscript thanks Farnese for a favor done the Bishop of Worcester [Richard Pate, elevated on July 8, 1541: *Letters and Papers* XVI, no. 981]. ⅔ page (16 lines)

11. From Ponte S. Pietro a Sieue [Pontassieve], November 7 to the same. He is journeying as planned, without stop or ceremony in Florence, the Duke of Florence being in Pisa. ½ page (12 lines)

[This was a normal five and one-half day journey, as I calculate from the most reliable itinerary: four and one-half days from Viterbo to Poggibonsi, another day to Florence and Pontassieve. Cf. the Boni itinerary in my *English Traveler to Italy* (Rome, 1954), I, 530.]

12. From S. Michel in Bosco, November 10, 1542, to the same. He is stopping outside Bologna [at the monastery]; Cardinal Morone has gone on to Mantua. The weather has been bad, and the roads [over the Apennines] poor, but the weather is now fair.

½ page (13 lines)

13. From "Dolce, 20 miles beyond Verona toward Trent," November 16, 1542, to the same. He has been entertained by the Cardinal of Mantua; he saw Ascanio Colonna [, brother of Vittoria].

1 page (21 lines)

[These four letters add details to the account of the journey. The chronology given by Pastor, *op. cit.*, XII, 154-156, is: October 16, the legates were designated; October 26, Pole left Rome, while the other two left on the 27 and 28; November 22, the legates entered Trent. Pole was to stay there until May 5, 1543 (Pastor, *op. cit.*, XII, 169)].

V. PERSONAL

14. From Trent, January 7, 1543, to the same. He asks that Pole's appointee as criminal judge in Viterbo, Messer Fran*ces*co Lelio da Treui, be permitted to stay in that post for three months.

1¼ pages

25. From Rome, September 11, 1543, to the same. Having just arrived, he has received Farnese's letter of the same day conveying the pope's wish to have him join him at Velletri on Thursday; he will depart tomorrow, and will follow Farnese's instructions ("mi gouernero in respondere"). ⅓ page (9 lines)

VI. LEGATE TO THE COUNCIL OF TRENT, 1545

26. From Trent, May 4, 1545, to Cardinal Santa Fiore, Chamberlain. As Pole predicted in writing from Mantua, he has arrived at Trent in three days, entering without ceremony. He has the best

lodging in the palace of all three legates; he asks that the pope be informed of his arrival. ⅓ page (10 lines)

[This letter gives the end of the story of Pole's journey to Trent, which for safety's sake he made two months after his two colleagues. The story of the dangers and the protection needed against them may now be fully told. Meantime I note that the date of arrival is confirmed by the entry in Massarelli's Diary [*Concilium Tridentinum,* Soc. Goerres. (Freiburg-i-B., 1901), I, 183]; the English envoy in Venice, Edmund Harvel, was wrong when he wrote on May 3 that Pole was already in Trent (*Letters and Papers,* XX i, 650). Pole's letter to the pope from Trent expressing thanks for his reception by the Cardinal of Mantua should now be dated May 4 or 5, rather than "February?" (*Calendar State Papers Venice,* V, no. 326).]

27. From the three legates at Trent, May 30, 1545, to the Duke di Castro, Captain-General of the Church. A letter of condolence on the death of his sister. Signed "Il Car*dina*le d*i* Monte," "Car*dina*le de S*an*ta ✠" [Croce], "Reg. Car*dina*lis Polus." ½ page (14 lines)

[The duke was Pierluigi Farnese, son of Pope Paul III; on August 22 he was to be created Duke of Parma and Piacenza (Massarelli, *op. cit.,* I, 247). The sister, Constanza, wife of the Conte di Santa Fiore, died on May 23 (*ibid.,* I, 195). On the same day the legates sent condolences to Cardinal Farnese, her nephew (*ibid.,* I, 196), then in Germany; on June 2 he passed through Trent on his way to Rome (*ibid.,* I, 198).]

28. From Cardinal Pole at Trent, July 19, 1545, to the Duke di Castro at Piacenza: autograph.

Ill$^{\text{mo}}$ sig$^{\text{or}}$ mio oss/$^{\text{mo}}$

V. Ex$^{\text{cia}}$ fa bene ad hauere cura alla securta mia, potendo esser secura ch*e* quello ch*e* ella fara a me in questa parte, sara fatto a vna cosa sua et cosi le prometto ch*e* non desidero piu longa vita, ch*e* quanto da poi il seruitio d*e*l nro Sig$^{\text{or}}$ Dio stia sempre al com*m*ando di sua S.$^{\text{ta}}$, della quale son creatura, et della sua ill$^{\text{ma}}$ Casa, dellaquale mi cognosco obligatissimo S.$^{\text{tor}}$. Et questa amoreuolezza, ch*e* V. Ex$^{\text{cia}}$ mi ha monstrato hora in daremi auiso delle machinationi [?] mi da piu contentezza d'a*nimo,* ch*e* non possa op*er*are in co*n*trario tutte le insidie d*e*l mondo: d*e*l quale auiso p*er* infinite volte baci la mano a V. Ex$^{\text{cia}}$ Io no*n* manchero di stare auertito et con bona guardia secondo il prudente et amoreuolissi*mo* consiglio suo, ne mi mouero di qua prima ch*e* sia auertito/piu inanzi da v Ex$^{\text{cia}}$, nel resto rimettendomi sempre alla providentia d*el* sig$^{\text{or}}$ Dio, et confortandomi con questa ferma persuasione, ch*e* esso, p*er* la cui causa io son p*er*seguitato, e molto magiore, et piu potente di colui, ch*e* mi p*er*seguita, et ch*e* p*er* sua bonta non mi lassara talemente esser oppresso, ch*e* non conuertisca sempre ogni cosa ch*e* po interuenire, a maiore honore suo et cosi sempre sia fatto o con la mia vita, o con la mia morte. Et con questo fo fine offere*n*domi come debbo esser, et son sempre stato diditissimo a ogni honore suo . . . Deditiss. S*er*$^{\text{tor}}$ Reg: Car$^{\text{le}}$ Polus. 2 pages

[It is good of your Excellency to concern yourself with my safety, and you may be sure that whatever you do for me in this respect will be done for one who is entirely yours; and I promise you that I do not desire to live any longer than I can serve our Lord God at the command of His Holiness, whose creature I am, and of your illustrious House, whose most grateful servant I am. And this kindness which your Excellency has shown in informing me of the plotting gives me more joy of spirit than can be affected by all the conspiracies in the world put together: for this information I kiss the hand of your Excellency an infinity of times. I shall not fail to remain alert and on guard according to your prudent and kind counsel, and I shall not move from here without first notifying your Excellency: for the rest, I entrust myself always to God's providence, and comfort myself with the firm assurance that He in whose cause I am persecuted is far greater and more powerful than he who persecutes me, and that in His goodness He will not let me be so oppressed as not to turn whatever may happen to His greater honor, and so may His will be done with either my life or my death. And with this I end, offering myself as I must be, and have always been most devoted to your entire honor. . . .]

[Pole's letter of thanks is amply explained by an entry in Massarelli's diary that the Duke of Castro informed the legates on July 18 of a plot against Pole; the duke's letter is apparently that of July 16 from Piacenza to the Cardinal Cervini (Santa Croce) to this effect, indicating that the duke is tracking down those who lie in wait for Pole [*Monumenta Tridentina,* edited by von Druffel and Brand, Heft 2 (Munich, 1884), no. 160, p. 158]. The diarist wrote down the names of the three leaders of the ambush, the names being the same as those on the following list. The diarist wrote further that the cardinal took precautions which he had not taken before, especially that of sleeping in a house next door—next to the palace, presumably. (*Concilium Tridentinum,* I, 222)].

Between 28 and 29 is a roughly scrawled list of twenty-four Italian names, mostly called captains, headed by "Il S^{r} lodouicho d*e*lle arme" and by two other leaders: "Il s^{r} Conte bernardo da Santo bonifatio" and "Il s^{r} Ffilippo pino d*a* lucha." 1⅓ pages

[The list is in principle the same as that sent by the English agent in Venice, Edmund Harvel, to Henry VIII on May 3, 1545 (*Letters and Papers,* XX i, no. 650.2) as hired at rates specified for military service in the war against France in Flanders: though five names vary in this Farnese list, as if the personnel had changed. No date or indication of origin appears on this sheet, but it may be assumed that it was sent to the duke by a papal agent in Venice, and was kept with the Pole letters. Cf. the latter part of this article for further details.]

29. From Trento, July 20, 1545, to the Duke di Castro at Piacenza. On receiving the warning from the duke, Pole had decided to depart ("partire") today against his own desire, since he had had a fever yesterday and feared to fall ill on the road. He promises not to move again without word from the duke. 1 page, same signature as 28.

[This letter is not now explicable, for if the roads were in fact unsafe, it would be the height of folly to move outside of Trent, and we have no record that Pole did move. Perhaps he found another residence within the city, or merely slept next door, as Massarelli noted.]

VII. ENGLISH AFFAIRS

15. From Civitella [, south of Rome], May 30, 1549, to Cardinal Farnese. He reported that his two gentlemen sent to England to confer with the Protector Somerset had had their way cleared by the imperial chancellor, Granvella, who was recommending them to the imperial envoy in England. The news from England was, however, that in religion matters were going from bad to worse.

1⅓ pages (22 plus 8 lines)

[In an exchange of letters, Pole had written May 6 to the protector concerning the return of England to the Church of Rome, the letter being conveyed by James Griffith, the papal penitentiary Richard Hilliard, and Michael Throckmorton of Pole's *familia*

(*Calendar State Papers, Venice,* V, 233-234). The protector's reply, apparently handed to the messengers, invited Pole to return to England to receive the royal mercy; he was also sent a copy of the new prayerbook (*Calendar State Papers, Domestic, 1547-1580,* VII, 28).]

20. An unsigned letter to Cardinal Pole from Rome, July 19, 1549. Written in a large scrawl, the letter was meant to accompany late foreign intelligence including news from England. The sender was evidently someone of high position in the curia, perhaps another cardinal. 1 page (16 lines, plus 3 in the margin)

16. From Civitella, July 29, 1549, Cardinal Pole to Cardinal Farnese. The penitentiary (Dr. Hilliard) has just returned from England; he will make report to the cardinal, and also to the pope. ½ page (10 lines)

[The letter is also in the St. Mark's Library collection of Pole manuscripts, Cl. X, cod. xxiv: *Calendar State Papers, Venice,* V, no. 570.]

VIII. PERSONAL

17. From Rome, April 5, 1553, to the same. Pole expresses great concern over the zeal of Signor Camillo in cutting down trees which are among the finest in Rome; he has expressed to him Farnese's displeasure. In a postscript Pole enlarges, in his own handwriting, on the loss: ". . . et pur so di essere assai sensuale in questa parte di prender piacere di giardini et arbori . . . quegli arbori mi parevano esser di bellezza non solam*en*te a quel giardino ma a tutta Roma dintorno alla quale non mi ricordo hauerne mai veduto alcun altro si bello et grande. . . ." (". . . and although I know that taking pleasure in garden and trees is rather sensual, . . . those trees seemed to confer beauty not only on that garden but on all Rome, and I do not remember ever having seen in all the region any other garden as large and beautiful.") 3 pages, plus autograph postscript of 13 lines.

[Signor Camillo is Camillo Orsini, captain-general of the papal forces from 1556, when he was blamed by Cardinal Caraffa for destroying many buildings in fortifying Rome against Spanish troops (*Calendar State Papers, Venice,* VI, no. 646).]

IX. THE RETURN HOME

18. From "the island in Lake Garda" ("Dall'Isola del lago di Garda"), September 20, 1553, but held until October 2, to Cardinal

Farnese. Pole acknowledges the letter conveying at once the bad news of the death of Farnese's brother, Duke Orazio [di Castro, in battle in Picardy on July 16], and the joyful news from England [of the death of the young King Edward VI]. Pole adds an autograph postscript to indicate his delaying the letter to give an account of the mission assigned to him to negotiate peace between France and the empire; he is sending ahead "my abbot" (Parpaglia). Now on October 2 he is ready to start north from Trent.
½ page, plus autograph postscript of 1½ pages.

[Numerous letters, mostly in the St. Mark's manuscripts, deal with this new day in Pole's life: they are calendared in *Calendar State Papers, Venice,* V. The news of the king's death had reached Venice by July 25 (*ibid.,* no. 759), and this letter 18 is well along in date.]

19. From Fontainebleau, March 31, 1554, to Cardinal Farnese. He acknowledges the letters from Farnese sent from Paris on February 12, which had reached Pole at Brussels, and from Avignon, conveyed by Cav. Tiburtio. He has been encouraged by the desire of the King of France to make peace on suitable terms. 1 page

[Pole was back in Brussels on April 20, when the emperor reproved him for not bringing specific proposals from France (*Calendar State Papers, Spain,* XII, 227.]

30. From Greenwich ["Grinuzzi") April 14, 1566, to Cardinal Farnese. He acknowledges a letter brought by M. Federigo Ferro. Concerning the church of Maconca, the bishop should write to him. For the other affairs, he asks the cardinal to write to Pole's *familiare,* M. Mariano Vittorio. 1 page

31. From Canturberi, April 13, 1557, to Cardinal Farnese. Thanks for his letter. He saw before his departure from court the duchess [of Parma] and her son the prince, who were made welcome by the queen. Pole takes pleasure and pain as well in the state of religion.
⅔ page (17 lines)

32. From Canturberi, April 28, 1557, to the same. He acknowledges the cardinal's letter brought by the secretary of the duke [of Parma] his brother; the secretary has been given an answer to the business question. Pole anticipates the departure of the duchess from the court, where she has made a good impression. ⅔ page (16 lines)

[The last two letters are supplementary to the more significant ones already known (in *Calendar State Papers, Venice,* VI). The duchess was the wife of Ottavio Farnese, the cardinal's brother; she was half-sister of Philip II, and was visiting his court in Brussels to obtain the return of part of her husband's duchy which had been taken over by Emperor Charles V to protect it from the French. In September, 1556, she had obtained some satisfaction (*Calendar,* no. 779), but she still had demands to make. In the following January, Queen Mary invited her, as her sister-in-law, to accompany Philip to England, and Pole had sent her a welcoming letter then (nos. 779, 783). Though the invitation was declined (nos. 793, 802), the duchess did come and, it was thought, completed her business with her brother (no. 892).

[Pole left the court on March 29, soon after Philip's arrival [E. H. Harbison, *Rival Ambassadors at the Court of Queen Mary* (New York, 1940), p. 322]. Letter 31 above is the first indication that he had seen the duchess. The day before he wrote letter 32, he wrote to Cardinal Farnese to say that he expected the duchess in two days, and acknowledged then also the cardinal's letter brought by the duke's secretary: the letter contained an account of the duke's new situation (*Calendar,* no. 868); on the same April 27, Pole also wrote to the duke acknowledging the letter and reporting his sight of the duchess at court (no. 869). Letter 32 seems then to be a duplicate to be sent, perhaps, by another hand, or else a follow-up to say that the secretary has Pole's reply. It is indicative of the Pole letters that 31 and 32 are in Parma, the two April 27 letters in Venice, and other letters in the Farnese collection in the Vatican.

[An amusing sidelight is seen in the belief at the French court that the duchess and her cousin, Christina of Denmark, now Duchess of Lorraine, had gone to England with the aim of bringing Princess Elizabeth back with them to be married to the Duke of Savoy (*Calendar,* nos. 866, 896).

[All this may be mere court gossip, but it demonstrates Pole's wide acquaintance with European royalty, which is likely to be overlooked when he is considered only as a Prince of the Church.]

THE DANGERS TO CARDINAL POLE

It seems proper to bring together the evidence for the reality of the dangers which Pole feared in his travels from the malevolence of

Henry VIII. It might be thought that the bodyguard of forty soldiers assigned him by the Duke of Ferrara on his journey to Trent in 1545 was excessive. Surely the King of England would hardly succeed in managing a roadside assault, at a distance of a thousand miles, on the fairly numerous company of a cardinal on mission. (Pole's company in the Low Countries in 1537 counted twenty-four Italians and French.[2]) Moreover, Pole was never actually harmed. On the other hand, the intent to capture or kill him was unmistakable, and the successful kidnapping in the Low Countries of William Tyndale in 1536 and of Sir John Cheke in 1556 shows that it could be done.

The plot begins when, after Pole's elevation to the cardinalate, the king's council wrote to him to censure his ingratitude, but, in view of some signs of obedience in his late letters, to propose that the king send persons to Flanders to hear him.[3] When he reached France, however, on his mission as legate to encourage Catholic revolt in England, Cromwell sent a special messenger to Paris to require that the English ambassador ask the King of France to arrest him as a traitor;[4] and the envoy in the Low Countries was instructed to ask that Pole be excluded from that country and, indeed, from the whole empire.[5] On April 21 the English envoy, Sir Francis Brian, was reported as bragging that if he came across Pole even in mid-France he would kill the cardinal himself.[6] On April 25 the king wrote direct to his envoys in France to order them to manage to have Pole moved on from Cambrai, and "by some means trussed up and conveyed" to Calais;[7] Pole was aware of the plan, and complained to Cromwell of Henry's turpitude in ignoring the immunity of an ambassador.[8]

At Cambrai, where Pole was forced to wait forty days to enter the Low Countries, he and his party reported spies and hirelings "seeking to intrude upon them and strike a blow." [9] The Cardinal of Liége proposed that he travel there surreptitiously in disguise, and Pole understood that Henry VIII had set a price on his head of 100,000 crowns of gold.[10] He was given government escort to Liége. There, in the territory of the cardinal prince-bishop, while Pole's friend Giberti tried to gain his reception by the queen regent at Brussels, an English spy, William Vaughan, was accepted in Pole's household as a pretended exile. Pole suspected him, however, and he escaped; Pole wrote of him to Rome as an assassin.[11] Meantime Cromwell was trying to enlist Michael Throckmorton, gentleman attendant on Pole, as a spy, and it is not surprising that the cardinal thought himself as much watched as an army.[12] His biographer later understood that the king offered the emperor, in exchange for Pole's person, an army of either 4,000 or 10,000 men.[13]

---

[2] *Calendar of Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry the VIII* (London, 1862 ff.), XII i, no. 1062. Hereafter this will be referred to as: *Letters and Papers.*

[3] *Ibid.,* XII i, no. 125: January 18, 1537.

[4] *Ibid.,* no. 760: March 28, 1537.

[5] Nos. 865, 866.

[6] No. 996.

[7] No. 1032.

[8] No. 1123.

[9] **Nos. 1052, 1053.**

Recalled to Rome, Pole refused to pass through France, as he says in letter 2 above; in another letter, he gives as his reason the indignity of the French king's refusal to receive him.[14] Planning to return by the Rhine, he surprised the English envoy at Antwerp by an early departure,[15] and traveled, apparently without incident, through Germany. Though he escaped English agents, the result of his journey was Henry VIII's wrath, which presently took the lives of Pole's oldest brother, Lord Montague, his cousin, Lord Exeter, and even eventually his aged mother, the Countess of Salisbury.

Pole's next venture took him to Nice with Pope Paul III for the conference in the summer of 1538 which brought a truce in the war between Charles V and Francis I. English observers were at hand in the emperor's train at Villefranche: Sir Thomas Wyatt, envoy to the emperor, who had come with him from Spain; John Mason, his secretary; and Dr. Haynes and Dr. Bonner, sent specially from England.[16] They might have engaged in plotting against Pole, either on the papal progress from Rome to Nice and back, eight weeks one way and five weeks returning, or in the five weeks at Nice;[17] but if so, Wyatt would have been sure to mention the fact in defending himself against the charge of conspiring with Pole. There is in sum no evidence of plotting against Pole in this journey to Nice, and no sign that Pole was apprehensive of any.

---

[10] *Poli Epistolae,* II, 55; *Letters and Papers,* XII i, 1042.

[11] *Ibid.,* XII, ii, nos. 73, 107.

[12] *Poli Epistolae,* II, 68.

[13] Beccadelli in *Poli Epistolae,* V, 366. The Italian original says 10,000, which the Latin version reduces to 4,000 (I, 16, as cited by Schenk, *op. cit.,* p. 87).

[14] *Ibid.,* II, 76.

[15] *Letters and Papers,* XII ii, no. 725.

[16] Sir Thomas Wyatt's oration refuting the charge, among others, that he had treated with Pole is given in G. F. Nott (Ed.), *Works of Surrey and Wyatt* (London, 1816), especially II, 279-280, 282.

It was after the return from Nice to Venice that Pole's *familia,* if not the cardinal himself, was to endure a shock. A lively student's letter from Thomas Theabolde, a protege of Cranmer's at Padua, reports the arrival at his lodging of one of Pole's company, Michael Throckmorton, "[early] in a morning, clothed in a coat of wolf-skins and a cap of mail, as pale as ashes, blowing and puffing" with fright. He had come thus encumbered in mid-August on the trail of a dubious Englishman, Henry Phillips, the betrayer of Tyndale in the Low Countries, who had been suspected there by the English in the summer before of working for Pole. Now he had arrived in Venice, and had seen the cardinal; but being found out in some lies, and being "clothed like a Svycer [Swiss] or ruffling man of war with Almain boots," he was suspected of being sent by Cromwell to destroy Pole. Theabolde was skeptical of danger of violence here, but Throckmorton explained the ease with which three or four "hardy fellows" might attack the cardinal when he rode out with five or six unarmed companions, and escape thereafter to the mountains in four hours: an Italian practice, it seemed, along with poisoning. Throckmorton was, indeed, "so troubled and dismayed that his life was half gone from him."[18] Theobolde reassured him that Phillips, whom he had run across in the north, was in effect banished from England, and would not, therefore, be an English agent. When Phillips then turned up in Padua, Theabolde persuaded him to return to Flanders and beg an English pardon. Since Pole threatened him with expulsion from Venetian territory, he had to go north again, first selling doublet and cloak to raise money.

Another alarm was caused Pole's *familia* by a second exile from England, James Griffith ap Howell. Theabolde had seen him also in Germany, and now was told in Padua by Throckmorton that the Welshman had gone on to Bologna en route to join Pole in Rome.

---

[17] Ludwig von Pastor, *History of the Popes* (St. Louis, 1923), XI, chapter vi.

[18] *Letters and Papers,* XIII ii, nos. 507, 509: October 1, 1538.

Throckmorton expected now, however, that Pole was about to turn him away also in his suspicion. "Every wagging of a straw maketh them now afraid," Theobalde wrote gleefully and Pole was running away from Rome. But the student was forbidden to see Pole himself, and may well have exaggerated. At some time Griffith came within the Pole circle, as we have seen above in letter 15 concerning Pole's envoys to England in 1549.

Pole's next mission sent him to Emperor Charles V and the King of France, now in a state of truce, to urge their suspension of trade with England. Pole departed from Rome secretly, the emperor was informed, because of the known efforts of the King of England to procure his death.[19] The actual journey to Barcelona and Toledo in the winter of 1539 seems to have been uneventful. Before Pole arrived at the imperial court, however, Henry had required his ambassador to demand his expulsion as an English traitor,[20] and the king wrote direct to Francis to demand Pole's arrest and extradition.[21] Francis thereupon bade Pole wait at Avignon, in papal territory.[22] Meantime the English envoy in Toledo, Sir Thomas Wyatt the poet, was breathing violence, reporting to Cromwell that Pole was organizing a papal army of 12,000 Germans and Italians to bring to the Low Countries to support English malcontents at home; and he promised grandiosely to have Pole assassinated and "to kindle a fire in Italy."[23] In April, Pole and his English *familia* were attainted by act of Parliament for having "stirred seditions in the realm."[24] We cannot be sure how many of these threats Pole knew about, but Cardinal Farnese told the emperor that Pole's reason for not proceeding to Paris was "solely because he feared for his life, knowing of the many plans made to ambush him by the King of England."[25] And letters 3 and 7 above give Pole's own awareness of the dangers, not only in France but across northern Italy to Verona. It should be noted that England received much of its Italian intelligence from the Italian merchant colony in Lyon, so that Pole's move-

[19] *Ibid.*, XIV i, no. 14.
[20] *Ibid.*, no. 279: February 13, 1539.
[21] *Ibid.*, no. 462: March 8, 1539.
[22] *Ibid.*, no. 602: March 25, 1539.
[23] *Ibid.*, no. 560: March 18, 1539.
[24] *Ibid.*, no. 867.
[25] *Poli Epistolae*, II, cclxxxv.

ments were doubtless well known in England. No danger actually resulted, in his summer journey of 1539 to Verona, from the "daily threats" of his letter 7 above.

Pole's travels were now limited to the Italian peninsula until he finally left for England in 1553. Meantime the dangers he had feared when Henry Phillips came to Venice threatened again in 1542. An Italian equerry of the King of England came to Viterbo, where Pole was governor, with two youths who called themselves Flemish but who were identified as English by Pole's *familia*. All were arrested, and sent on to Rome;[26] the Venetian envoy carried the rumor that the three had planned to kill Pole.[27] But later the Italian at least was released, and went back to England by way of Venice,[28] and we do not know if the plot was real or imagined.

The journey to Trent in the autumn of 1542 may not, in fact, have been dangerous. Letters 10 and 11 above, however, suggest a strangely surreptitious kind of travel, when the three cardinals traveled separately, in lay costume, avoiding important cities, and not stopping for any ceremony. Possibly mere haste was involved, but danger to Pole is a possible explanation as it certainly explains the second journey in 1545. Now the fear and the danger are both fully documented.

In January, 1545, an Italian nobleman returned to Venice from the service of the English king to hire further Italian mercenary captains[29] to serve in Flanders in the war against France. He was Ludovico Dalle Armi of Bologna, nephew of the late Cardinal Campeggio. By March 1 his activities, duly authorized by the English government, had become well known. His father was cited to Rome to answer for his son's service of a schismatic, and the rumor reached Venice, and even Brussels, that Cardinal Pole feared to go to Trent because of the gathering of these recruits in northern Italy.[30] On March 5 another of the legates, Cardinal Cervini, wrote from Bologna on his way that Ludovico was said to be in the Veneto, and that San Bonifatio was on his way toward Rome.[31] On March 13, Cervini and Del Monte had arrived in Trent, having seen no trace of the mercenaries but learning at Trent that Ludovico had been there just before they came.[32] He may, of course, have been on his way north to his employment.

---

[26] *Ibid.*, III, 99-101; calendared in *Letters and Papers,* XVII, nos. 535, 539, 551.

[27] *Ibid.*, no. 590.

[28] *Ibid.*, no. 767.

[29] *Letters and Papers,* XX i, no. 87.

[30] *Ibid.*, nos. 292, 417.

[31] *Poli Epistolae,* IV, 184.

Because of this danger, Pole was detained by the pope until after Easter. I do not know when he left Rome, but he was at Bologna by April 27,[33] where he took a military escort to Ferrara. He was reported in Ferrara, thirty miles away on April 29;[34] he would need two days further to reach Mantua, sixty miles by river and canal, arriving on May 1; and the three days specified in letter 26 above would bring him to Trent, eighty miles, on May 4, when he wrote the letter. No danger resulted in fact. The Duke of Ferrara insisted on supplying his own escort; twenty crossbowmen in a barge accompanying Pole's, and twenty horsemen to ride along river and canal.[35] But this was only to Ostiglia, we learn, on the Mantua border, and presumably Mantua furnished further escort. But for most of the three days after Mantua the road lay through Venetian territory, where the Italian mercenaries would have been billeted or moving about before going north to Flanders. What guard did Pole have through this zone? Did he go by the main road through his well-loved Verona, or by the less traveled road along Lake Garda, still in Venetian domain? We do not know, but he arrived safely.

Meantime the mercenaries can be partly traced. On January 25, 1545, L'Armi (as the English called him) had arrived in Venice from England, and began recruiting.[36] By March 30 some twenty-six captains had been collected for the war in Flanders.[37] If Dalle Armi had been in Trent on March 11, as the two cardinals had reported, he must have been engaged in the recruiting. The complaints of his activity mounted, but he seems, in fact, to have gone on to Flanders. He is next reported in Trent on July 4 on his way to his home in Bologna, and the Trent diarist understood that he had left England on June 7.[38] If so, he must certainly have left Italy in early May. He had then, in fact, been within striking distance of Trent from January to May, and represented a plausible danger until after Pole arrived in Trent on May 4.

---

[32] *Ibid.*, IV, 185.

[33] *Ibid.*, IV, 187-188.

[34] *Letters and Papers,* XX i, no. 617.

[35] Massarelli in *Concilium Tridentinum,* Soc. Goerres. (Freiburg-i-B., 1901), I, 184, n. 1.

[36] *Letters and Papers,* XX i, no. 87.

[37] *Ibid.*, no. 450.

[38] *Concilium Tridentinum,* I, 214.

It was Ludovico's reappearance in July which caused the scare reported in letters 28 and 29 above and in the Trent diary. His uncle, the Bishop of Feltre, was in Trent, and vouched for him to the legates; nonetheless, they could only suspect anyone in the service of "an impious king, enemy of the Apostolic See," and ordered him arrested in Bologna.[39] He does not seem to have gone there, and probably went about his recruiting business. On July 13 he sent off from Venice a company of soldiers, described by the English envoy in the despatch which they carried for him as a band of horsemen, later (July 29) as eighty men but no officer.[40] On July 17 the soldiers asked leave to ride through the city of Trent on their way, showing a pass from the Spanish envoy to Venice; they were described as twenty-five arquebusiers or hand-gun men with packhorses, under Captain Mancino of Bologna, though the next day the number was reported as fifty.[41]

At once the excitement came to a boil. The Cardinal of Trent refused passage. Intelligence reached the Duke di Castro at Piacenza, who wrote on July 16 to Cardinal Cervini to announce a plot against Pole which he was running down ("son' dietro a la traccia et spero di guingerla presto"); he urged the cardinal to warn Pole and to persuade him to delay ("farlo indugiare").[42] Presumably it was a more formal letter to the three legates which was reported by the diarist on July 18, since it included the names of the three captains.[43] The result would be Pole's letter of thanks of July 19 (letter 28 above), his spending the nights outside the palace as reported by the diarist, and his letter of July 20 (letter 29 above) about his moving. On July 25 the legates issued an ordinance forbidding the carrying of arms [firearms?] in Trent, and prohibiting any man from putting his hand to his sword; from one hour after sunset no man might carry arms without at the same time carrying a light.[44]

---

[39] *Ibid.*, I, 214, 216.

[40] *Letters and Papers*, XX i, nos. 1188, 1310.

[41] *Concilium Tridentinum*, I, 220, 222.

[42] *Monumenta Tridentina*, edited by August von Druffel, Heft 2 (Munich, 1884), no. 160, p. 158.

[43] *Concilium Tridentinum*, I, 222.

[44] *Ibid.*, I, 226.

The scare at once died down, and already on July 23 the duke wrote to Cardinal Cervini: "Those colonels and captains are indeed hired and paid by the king, nonetheless it could be that they were not intent on so criminal a purpose: for I have not yet found any good evidence." [45] The diarist says no more until August 22, when he records the fact that Ludovico Dalle Armi passed through Trent toward Germany, riding post with three companions;[46] he arrived in Brussels on September 1.[47] Pole, as it turned out, had nothing to fear from him in Trent, but the police precautions were, of course, essential.

The end was not yet. In the following spring, that is by March 26, Dalle Armi was back in Venice from the campaign where he resumed his recruiting.[48] In Venice in July he was reported by Spanish intelligence as arousing new alarm in Cardinal Pole, who had left Trent ill in late June and spent the summer at Treville only fifteen miles from Venice.[49] I do not find record of this alarm in the Pole letters, and his journey to Rome that autumn seems to have been uneventful. Actually, D'Armi's turbulence aimed at Venetian victims, and a murder which he committed at the time when Pole reached Rome led to his eventual execution in May, 1547.[50] King Henry had died in the preceding January, and I know of no later fears of Pole or threats to his life. For nearly ten years, however, the threats had been as real as they had been serious.

Queens College

---

[45] *Monumenta Tridentina, op. cit.*, p. 158.
[46] *Concilium Tridentinum*, I, 247.
[47] *Calendar of State Papers . . . Venice* (London, 1873), V, no. 356.
[48] *Letters and Papers*, XXI i, nos. 466, 604, 625, 655, 656.
[49] *Ibid.*, 1288.
[50] *Calendar of State Papers . . . Venice*, V, 177-217.

BOOK REVIEWS

GENERAL CHURCH

Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche. Begründet von Dr. Michael Buchberger. Zweite, völlig neu bearbeitete Auflage unter dem Protektorat von Erzbischof Dr. Michael Buchberger, Regensburg, und Erzbischof Dr. Eugen Seiterich, Freiburg im Breisgau. Herausgegeben von Josef Höfer, Rom, und Karl Rahner, Innsbruck. Vol. I, *A-Baronius* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Verlag Herder; New York: Herder and Herder, Inc. 1957. Cols. 48, 1272, with 13 maps and 10 plates); Vol. 2, *Barontus-Cölestiner* (1958. Cols. 1256, with 11 maps and 19 plates); Vol. 3, *Colet-Fastenberger* (1959. Cols. 1344, with 9 maps and 9 plates); Vol. 4, *Faith and Order—Hannibaldis* (1960. Cols. 1352, with 8 maps and 11 plates). (Each volume cloth, $21.60; leather $24.20. Subscription price, $18.70 [cloth binding].)

In the thirties (1930-1938), under the general editorship of Dr. Michael Buchberger, Bishop of Regensburg, Herder published the excellent ten-volume Catholic encyclopedia, *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*. Although described on the title page as a second and revised edition of Herder's *Kirchliches Handlexikon* (2 vols. 1907-1912; reprinted 1921), it was really an entirely new work, a well-planned, up-to-date, and authoritative Catholic encyclopedia, which was warmly welcomed not only in German-speaking countries but throughout the rest of the scholarly world as well. Owing to the destruction of copies and plates in World War II, but, above all, to the profound changes which have taken place in the world in general and in the Catholic world in particular during the past three decades, German Catholics decided that in spite of the formidable difficulties involved a new edition of the *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* was absolutely necessary. Publication of the new *Lexikon* began in 1957, and four volumes of the projected ten have already appeared within less than four years. An examination of the volumes published indicates that the so-called second edition of the *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* is really a new work in every way and should be regarded as such.

The new *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* is published by Herder under the patronage of Dr. Michael Buchberger, Archbishop of Regensburg, and Dr. Eugen Seiterich (died March 3, 1958), Archbishop of Freiburg im Breisgau, and now under the latter's successor Dr. Hermann Schaüfele. The two editors-in-chief are Monsignor Josef Höfer, Rome, and

Father Karl Rahner, S.J., Innsbruck. They are assisted by six staff-editors. As in the old edition, the general editors are assisted also by area specialists. The number of special areas and area specialists has been increased from thirty-three in the old edition to fifty-one in the new. The new *Lexikon* is at least one fifth larger than the old and the number of separate articles is likewise larger. The old edition has about 30,000 articles, but the new, so far as can be determined by a rough estimate, will have several thousand more. To insure greater authority in the content of articles, the number of contributors has been more than doubled. As against 300 contributors to Volume I of the old edition, nearly 700 are listed for Volume I of the new, and the same ratio is maintained in Volumes II-IV. It is to be noted, too, that a considerable number of foreign specialists appear in the lists of contributors. As will be indicated below, the longer articles are regularly divided among several specialists, but, through careful editorial supervision, unity is always preserved. All articles, whether long or short, are signed.

Special attention, obviously, has been given to bibliography. Bibliographies, in almost all cases, are well-balanced, stress sources and authoritative studies or monographs, and, as is customary in German works, are amazingly up-to-date.

Every effort has been made to save space and unnecessary repetition by an elaborate use of abbreviations and cross-references. The introductory pages of Volume I (pp. 7*-48*) present the following lists of abbreviations used throughout: Books of the Bible, Apocrypha, Apostolic Fathers, Dead Sea Scrolls, General Abbreviations and Symbols, Significant Modern Cities, Religious Orders (including the non-official names for the most common), and an unusually full list of abbreviations for Collections of Sources, Periodical Publications, Works of Reference, etc. (16*-48*). Cross-references are made by a lemma in boldface type, but much more frequently by the use of an oblique arrow before the name of a person, place, or institution which is treated in a separate article in the *Lexikon*. An enormous amount of space is saved by the use of such arrows, but the attractiveness of the text—at least for a foreigner—suffers considerably, and especially when numerous arrows appear within ten or a dozen lines. The print in the new edition is much clearer than in the old. Bibliographies are printed in smaller type, but names of authors, collections, or reference works listed in the bibliographies are in boldface and immediately catch the eye.

The new *Lexikon* marks a distinct advance over the old in illustrations and maps. There are no cuts within the text, but there are a number of well-executed plates, each containing usually several separate illustrations. The maps are also presented as plates. They are simple in design, with black and red lines or shadowing, and with symbols indicating in detail the features to be noted. All names stand out clearly and there is no overcrowding. The *Lexikon* is royal octavo in size and is substantially bound in heavy red cloth.

So much for general description. It is now in order to give a sampling of the rich content of the *Lexikon* and to call attention to the importance of some typical articles. The reviewer, of course, does not pretend that he is competent to express a strictly critical judgment on more than a fraction of the articles that will be mentioned. Only a corps of specialists could hope to review the *Lexikon* adequately.

The new *Lexikon* has placed a marked emphasis on theology. Relatively speaking, more space is given to theological articles than to others, so that theological subjects can be treated with greater fullness and adequate attention given to historical backgrounds. The bibliographies in the theological articles are, in general, much more extensive than those in other fields. Many of the longer articles, furthermore, have been divided into two or more parts, each written by a specialist. The use and effective integration of pertinent data from various disciplines is an outstanding feature of the more important articles throughout the new *Lexikon*. Father Karl Rahner, one of the editors-in-chief, has contributed a number of leading theological articles or parts of articles. Among the articles that deserve to be mentioned here may be listed the following: "Agnostizismus" (J. DeVries and K. Rahner); "Altes Testament als heilgeschichtliche Periode" (K. Rahner and F. J. Schierse); "Amerikanismus" (G. Weigel—the only accurate treatment of the subject to be found in a European encyclopedia); "Analysis fidei" (F. Malmburg); "Anschauung Gottes" (R. Schnackenburg and K. Forster); "Anthropologie, Theologische A." (K. Rahner); "Askese" (R. Mohr, R. Schnackenburg, D. Thalhammer, A. Görres, L. Beirnert); "Atheismos" (C. Regamey, K. Rahner, F. Nümann); "Auferstehung Christi" (J. Schmitt, W. Bulst, K. Rahner, E. Lucchesi-Palli); "Auferstehung des Fleisches" (J. Ratzinger, G. J. Botterweck, J. Schmid); "Biblische Theologie" (V. Hamp, H. Schlier, K. Rahner); "Bussakrament" (K. Rahner, W. Böhmer, B. Häring); "Dogmatik" (K. Rahner, W. Lohff); "Dogmenentwicklung" (K. Rahner); "Dreifaltigkeit" (H. Rahner, J. Felderer, W. Braunfels, W. Dürig, K. Hofmann); "Dualismus" (J. Henninger, R. Schnackenburg, J. Auer, H. Kuhn, G. Ludwig, H. Rollinik); "Erkenntinis-u. Methodenlehre, Theologische E." (A. Lang); "Eschatologie, theol.-wissenschaftstheoretisch" (K. Rahner); "Eucharistie" (J. Betz, V. H. Elbern, H. Gescher); "Formale und fundamentale Theologie" (K. Rahner); "Freiheit" (G. Siewerth, P. Bläser, K. Rahner, G. Fischer); "Glaube" (R. Schnackenburg, J. Trütsch, W. Fannenberg, H.

Schuster, N. Krautwig); "Gnade" (J. Haspecker, F. Mussner, A. Auer, K. Rahner); "Gnostizismus" (K. Prümm, K. Schubert, R. Schnackenburg, H. Rahner, K. Algermissen).

The articles dealing with the fathers and doctors of the Church, and with liturgy, catechetics, canon law, etc., are, in general, very good—in spite of their brevity in some cases—and uniformly up-to-date in every way. Special attention is called to the excellent articles on Protestantism and on non-Christian religions, e.g.: "Anglikanische Kirche und Kirchengemeinschaft" (H. Marot, Y. Congar); "Anglikanische Weihen" (F. Clark); "Barth, K." (H. Bouillard); "Calvin," and "Calvinismus" (E. W. Zeeden); "Dialektische Theologie" (H. Bouillard); "Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland" (J. P. Michael); "Brahmanismus" (C. Regamey); "Buddhismus" (C. Regamey, M. Eder, Kiichi Numazawa).

There are numerous excellent articles in the biblical field, e.g.: "Abraham" (V. Hamp, J. Schmid, V. H. Elbern); "Adam" (J. Schildenberger, W. Neuss); "Apokalypse" (J. Michl); "Bibel" (B. Hessler, J. A. Jungmann, H. Schauerte); "Bibelkritik" (J. Schmid); "Bibelübersetzungen" (J. Ziegler, K. Th. Schäfer, V. Hamp, A. Vööbus, J. Assfalg, A. Böhlig, J. Molitor, G. Patti, W. Wissmann, J. Schmid); "Bibelübersetzungen, moderne" (J. Schmid, J. Kürzinger, P. W. Skehan, E. Beaucamp, J. van Dodewaard); "Biblische Hermeneutik" (A. Bea); "Daniel" (F. Dingermann, V. H. Elbern, G. Schreiber); "Entmythologisierung" (H. Fries); "Exegese" (R. Schnackenburg, K. H. Schelkle, J. Schmid, H. G. Beck, J. Assfalk, A. Kleinhans, H. Greeven); "Formgeschichtliche Methode" (R. Schnackenburg); "Genus litterarum" (V. Hamp).

In the fields of philosophy and psychology, it will euffice to mention typical articles like the following: "Akt" (J. B. Lotz, A. van Kol); "Albertus Magnus" (W. Kübel); "Analogia entis (Analogie)" (E. Coreth, E. Przywara); "Arabisch-islamische Theologie und Philosophie des Mittelalters" (J. M. Abd-el-Jalil); "Archetyp" (J. Goldbrunner); "Aristotelismus" (F. van Steenberghen); "Ästhetik" (H. Bombach); "Christliche Philosophie" (J. B. Metz); "Daseinanalyse" (R. Hostie); "Deismus" (J. T. Engert); "Denkform" (G. Söhngen); "Descartes" (R. Lauth); "Deutscher Idealismus" (J. Möller); "Dialektischer und historischer Materialismus" (J. Hommes); "Ethik" (R. Mohr, E. Coreth, W. Künneth); "Existentialethik" (F. Böckle); "Existenzphilosophie" (H. Krings); "Frühscholastik" (Z. Alzeghy); "Gegenwart(sweisen)" (A. Darlapp); "Geschichtsphilosophie" (K. Gründer, R. Spaemann); "Gestalt, Gestaltpsychologie" (E. Zellinger); "Grund" (L. Oeing-Hanhoff); "Habitus" (J. Auer, N. Seelhammer).

In the field of history there are a number of general articles which deserve special commendation, e.g.: "Aufklärung" (A. Schwarz, E. Hegel,

A. J. Scheffczyk); "Barock" (L. Lenhart, F. Stegmüller, J. Weingartner, K. G. Federer); "Bernhardinisches Zeitalter" (H. Wolter); "Byzantinisches Reich" (H. G. Beck); "Christenverfolgungen" (K. Gross, B. Stasiewski, K. Müller); "Französische Revolution" (S. Skalweit); "Frühchristliche Kirche" (H. Rahner); "Gallikanismus" (L. Just); "Gegenreformation" (E. W. Zeeden); "Geistliche Fürsten" (K. Bosl); "Geschichte" (A. Darlapp); "Gregorianische Reform" (F. Kempf). The two following comprehensive articles may be described as historical, philosophical, and theological in content: "Abendland" (K. Rahner), and, especially, "Christentum" (K. Rahner).

Biography, hagiography, and the history of religious orders and congregations are covered with exceptional completeness through a large number of short articles. Even the shortest articles give the essential information and are always furnished with pertinent bibliography. In the articles on the saints there is always a section on iconography and on the role of the given saint in Christian legend and folklore. The articles on the angels and on the great figures of the Old and New Testament also include a similar section.

Among the articles in the political and social sciences, including anthropology and education, may be listed, e.g.: "Aberglaube" (R. Mohr, G. J. Botterweck, B. Häring, H. Schauerte); "Absolutismus" (L. Just); "Abstammung des Menschen" (K. Rahner, J. Kälin); "Alexandrinische Schule" (H. Rahner, H. Kuhn); "Antiochenische Schule" (H. Rahner); "Arbeit" (A. Vögtle, H. Rondet, R. Hofmann, J. Fellermeier); "Bildung" (F. X. Eggersdorfer); "Demokratie" (G. Kafka); "Deszendenztheorie" (A. Haas, P. Overhage); "Ehe" (J. Haspecker, J. Michl, H. Volk, R. Angermair, J. Wenner, J. P. Michael); "Frau" (A. Closs, J. Michl, J. Mörsdorf, W. Leibrand, A. Ludat, M. Hain).

The articles on continents, countries, cities, etc., are well-balanced. It is only natural that "Deutschland" (an excellent article by H. Tüchle, E. Iserloh, L. Just, and H. Auhofer) should receive twenty-five columns, but "Frankreich," e.g., gets ten columns, and "England," eight. The great majority of such articles, and especially those devoted to dioceses, are short and are largely confined to statistics, but the accompanying bibliographies furnish guidance to more detailed treatments.

The fields of languages, literatures, art and archaeology, and music, insofar as they fall within the scope of the *Lexikon*, are adequately covered. Among the articles in these fields the following deserve to be formally mentioned: "Altar" (T. Klauser); "Ausgräbungen in Palästina" (H. Haag); "Basilika" (L. Völki, A. Frutaz); "Bibelgriechisch" (J. Ziegler); "Byzantinische Kunst" (W. Sas-Zoloziecky); "Dante Alighieri" (H. Rheinfelder); "Dialoge" (H. Rahner); "Dichtung, christlichreligiöse" (a comprehensive article covering the ancient, mediaeval, and modern literatures by thirteen specialists); "Epigraphik" (a comprehensive article covering Semitic, Early Christian, Byzantine, Armenian, and Georgian inscriptions by respective specialists); "Frühchristliche Kunst" (W. N. Schmacher, W. F. Volbach); "Frühchristliche Musik" H. Hucke); "Glasmalerei" (H. Merten); "Goldschmiedekunst" (A. Lipinky); "Goethe" (P. Meinhold); "Gotik, gotische Kunst" (F. Dambeck); "Griechisch, altchristliches G." (C. Mohrmann); also the articles "Genus litterarum," and "Barock," listed earlier.

In the first four volumes of the *Lexikon,* there are very few formal articles in the field of the biological and physical sciences and technology. It will suffice to mention "Atom" (G. Ludwig, H. Rollinik), "Automation" (T. Mayer-Maly), and "Genetik" (C. Harte). However, the latest data furnished by the various sciences are fully utilized in numerous other articles. The only significant article so far published in the field of mass media of communication and entertainment is that on "Film" (A. Kochs).

An encyclopedia of its very nature is exposed to the criticism of the specialist and non-specialist alike. Thus, no two persons would agree completely on the articles selected, the length of articles, and the emphasis on various aspects of their content. The reviewer, e.g., would have liked the following articles to be longer: "Ästhetik," "Augustinismus," "Augustinus," "Demographie," "Diktatur," "Episkopalisten," and "Fortschritt." The article "Antisemitismus" is rather short and there is no reference in the bibliography to the important article "Antisemetismo" in the *Enciclopedia Cattolica* or to S. Baron's *Social and Religious History of the Jews.* The article "Augustinusregel" gives the impression that W. Hümpfner's position is universally accepted, which is certainly not the case.

But such criticisms are minor. The new *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* is a magnificent work, critical, accurate, and amazingly up-to-date in its articles and bibliographies. It sticks rigorously to the scope defined in the *Vorwort.* No article is included which does not deal directly or at least in some appreciable way with the Church. Each of the major articles, as pointed out earlier, is usually written by two or more specialists, but unity is maintained. As a result, many articles are unrivalled syntheses based on the competent employment of the data of all the pertinent disciplines as, e.g., articles like "Auferstehung Christi," "Dreifaltigkeit," "Dualismus," "Ehe," "Eschatologie," "Exegese," "Gott," etc. The new *Lexikon* is a monument to contemporary German Catholic scholarship at its best. Let us hope that the same rapid tempo of publication can be maintained and that the whole work will be available within the next three or four years. It is a great pity that ignorance of

German in even so-called scholarly circles in our country will prevent the wide use among us that such an indispensable work of reference deserves to enjoy.

MARTIN R. P. MCGUIRE

The Catholic University of America

The Historic Reality of Christian Culture, A Way to the Renewal of Human Life. By Christopher Dawson. (New York: Harper & Bros. 1960. Pp. 124. $3.00.)

This is the first volume of the series "Religious Perspectives" under the general editorship of Ruth Nanda Anshen. The general goal of the series is to "show the fallacy of the apparent irrelevance of God in history." It is fitting that Dawson inaugurate such a series; during the past forty years his work has had as its central theme the relationship of religion and culture, and the effects of an increasing secularization of our own Christian civilization. This brief work both summarizes much of his well known efforts in the field, and adds yet new insights into a problem which he rightly claims is becoming ever more serious.

In eight chapters, the author defines the conditions of a Christian culture, the characteristics of a Christian civilization, some of the special problems that have arisen during the "Six Ages of the Church," and the peculiar nature of the current crisis. In effect, he holds that neither our culture nor any aspect of our civilization is honestly studied until and unless we take account of Christianity as the foundation of both. The moral energy, and moral unity, as well as the spiritual dynamism so characteristic of the western world, is owing to its specific religious roots. While Christianity is seen as relevant to and for every human pursuit, at the same time Dawson does not identify Christianity and Christendom, nor does he idealize any Christian era.

The increasing dominance of "secular counter-religions" is attributed in a large measure to the loss of Christian unity after the Renaissance and the social failure of Christianity during the nineteenth century. Dawson is a Christian humanist, and in his chapter on "Christian Culture as a Culture of Hope" it is clear that he expects the life of humanity to continue to be leavened and "remolded by this divine influence." Yet, he is clearly worried that the increasing demands of the secular state may make it possible to root out or ignore more and more of the Christian tradition. He takes for granted that a secular culture can easily absorb and assimilate the products of a "religious primary education," and he places much of his hope in the development of quality *higher* education under Christian influence or auspices.

This capsule account may lead those unfamiliar with Dawson's work to think this book yet another rehash of the ills of our age, written in a spirit of malicious joy over the collapse of liberal idealism, the gospel of secular progress, and the comeuppance of those who did not need God as an hypothesis. On the contrary, it is the product of an historian and cultural anthropologist who has thought long on the subject, who remains aware that the Church both exists in history and transcends it, and who is capable of stating the case for a renewal of Christian culture with a quiet eloquence that convinces. Of course, it may not convince everyone. Dawson thinks change is possible, but he does believe that it is the "intellectual and social inertia of Christians that is the real obstacle to the restoration of Christian culture."

The working historian might read this book to observe how beautifully a variety of disciplines may be brought to bear upon historical problems, with not a seam showing between the joints of any one of them. The undergraduate student might well read it to learn how the scholar may be also an artist. The Christian should read it to clarify his thoughts concerning our present situation and to take hope that the time may yet be redeemed.

STANLEY J. IDZERDA

Michigan State University

Popes through the Ages. By Joseph S. Brusher, S.J. (Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc. 1959. Pp. xiv, 530. $14.95 regular edition; $25.50 de luxe edition.)

If a book should be judged according to the intentions of the author and the publisher, *Popes through the Ages* would appear at first sight to deserve the praise lavished on it in advertisements, the dust jacket, and Cardinal McIntyre's foreword. Beautifully printed, copiously illustrated, and written by a trained historian, this imposing volume offers a new approach to the popularization of church history: it presents each of the popes from St. Peter to John XXIII in two facing, superroyal pages. On the left hand is a biographical sketch in two columns; the margin above the text is embellished with a coat-of-arms. These drawings are purely decorative for the first ten centuries but more or less accurate for more recent times, although the shadings do not conform to the rules of heraldry for black-and-white reproductions. On the odd-numbered pages are the portraits (sixteen in full color); the round pictures are elaborately framed with hand-drawn roses, lilies, and poinsettias. The practical value of the book is enhanced by two historical essays on papal elections and St. Peter's Basilica and by an adequate index. Unfortunately, no bibliography is supplied for the general reader who might like to deepen his acquaintance with the lives of certain pontiffs.

From this external description of the aim and plan of the work one is naturally led to question the wisdom of the whole conception. Is it reasonable to devote as much space to Stephen II, whose name was not even included in some early catalogues of the popes because, dying three days after his election, he was never consecrated Bishop of Rome, as to Pius IX, whose reign lasted almost thirty-two years? The difference, moreover, is not merely quantitative; both St. Pius X and John XV occupied the chair of Peter for about eleven years, but they are hardly of equal importance in ecclesiastical history. It seems to serve no admissible purpose to fill just as many pages with uncertain and inconsequential details from the forty-five pontificates that passed in such rapid succession between 855 and 1049 as are allowed according to this plan for the last forty-five pontificates, which cover the whole modern era from 1513 to the present. The inevitable result is a grotesquely unbalanced presentation that overemphasizes the early Middle Ages and treats the last five centuries with disturbing superficiality.

Attempting to be candid and objective, the author does not hesitate to reveal the shady side of several papal characters. He also endeavors to give the discoveries and conclusions of recent scholarship in this vast field. While it may be unfair to note the omission of various points in sketches which do not pretend to be exhaustive, it seems legitimate at least to call certain dogmatically asserted interpretations into doubt. The author, for example, appears to distort the history of iconoclasm by repeating the unlikely stories about an imperial decree of Leo III in 726 and a Roman synod under Gregory II in 727 (p. 178). He is much too lenient in his treatment of Stephen IV's conduct (p. 190) and much too favorable in his account of Gregory IV's mediation between Louis the Pious and his sons (p. 204). It is impossible to know whether the author accepts the Fourth Council of Constantinople as an ecumenical council, for he refers to it as "the synod of 869-870, the so-called Eighth Ecumenical Council," which was "wiped out" by the synod of 879-880 (p. 216). It is more likely that Gregory VI was simply deposed than that he abdicated (p. 294). Victor II, it is said, "was not the man to truckle to the Emperor" (p. 302); on the contrary, he was practically the imperial chaplain. Accepting the biased story of Peter the Deacon regarding the election of Victor III, the author gives an uncritical summary which glosses over the past faults and character weaknesses of this pope (p. 312). Not a word is said about the important reform measures undertaken by Urban II (p. 314). In general the author fails to indicate the higher significance of the struggles between the popes and the emperors in the thirteenth century. There is no explanation of the omission of the name of John XX, and no suggestion of John XXI's maladroit and disastrous handling of the Greeks (p. 370). The conciliatory attitude of Benedict XI is misinterpreted; he was not an appeaser, and he did not absolve "right and left" (p. 384). It is barely hinted that Boniface IX sold ecclesiastical offices or benefices for hard cash (p. 402); and the sketch of Alexander VI is unsatisfactory, for it contains no mention of his simoniacal election or his part in the tragic end of Savonarola (p. 424). The author does not tell why Urban VIII's reform of the breviary "brought anguished cries from many quarters" (p. 470). The treatment of modernism is misleading (p. 514), and it is disappointing to find no hint of Pius XII's teaching accomplishments through his numerous encyclicals and allocutions (p. 520). These references are sufficient to demonstrate how difficult it is to avoid dangerous oversimplifications and how essential to investigate each aspect thoroughly even for a popularization.

Even more regrettable is the immense number of factual errors in this book. Pope Telesphorus "ruled the Church" in the time of Emperor Hadrian, not in the time of Antoninus Pius (p. 16). The Lateran is incorrectly described as a "stately palace overlooking the forum with its proud pagan monuments" (p. 64). It is not true that after the Council of Sardica (343) "Emperor Constans supported the Arian George, until the usurper died," and only then allowed Athanasius to return to Alexandria (p. 70); it was rather Constantius who supported the Arian rival Gregory; George made his entry into Alexandria only in 357. Emperor Anastasius died in 518, not in 517 (p. 104). The day of St. Leo II's death and feast is not June 28 but July 3 (p. 160). Benedict III did not make Anastasius the Librarian an abbot (p. 210); Nicholas I did in 862. The see of Bishop Arsenius is given as both Horta and Orta (pp. 210 and 214). Stephen X (Cardinal Frederick) had not been "consecrated" by Victor II after he was elected Abbot of Monte Cassino (p. 304). The anti-pope Cadalus (Honorius II) was Bishop of Parma, not of Pavia (p. 308). The Archbishop of Lund, Eskil, was not murdered, but robbed, maltreated, and held prisoner for ransom (p. 334). The Third Lateran Council was not "the tenth general council," but the eleventh (p. 336). Urban III was, indeed, elected "on the very day of Lucius' death," but on November 25, 1185, not on December 25 (p. 340). On page 410 there are no fewer than three mistakes: Gabriele Condulmer was born in 1383, not in 1338; the Byzantine emperor at the Council of Florence was John VIII, not John VII; and Eugene IV died in 1447, not in 1431. The Council of Trent was opened in 1545, not in 1547 (p. 440). Gregory XIII introduced the reformed calendar in 1582, not in

1578 (p. 452). The Union of Brest took place in 1595, not in 1598 (p. 462). Paul V is said to have been born in 1550 and to have been "a vigorous fifty-two when elected" in 1605 (p. 466). A lack of space precludes the listing of all the wrong dates (days of the month) given throughout the book.

Some of the frequent errors which are, perhaps, typographical but none the less inexcusable may be mentioned briefly: p. 72 for "335" read "355"; p. 100 for "Photinus" read "Photius"; p. 130 for "apocrisarius" read "apocrisiarius"; p. 142 for "658" read "638"; p. 190 for "Passious" read "Passivus"; pp. 198 and 200 for "Orthodox" read "orthodox"; p. 226 for "886" read "896"; p. 270 for "John III" read "John XIII"; p. 316 for "111" read "1111"; p. 344 for "1157" read "1187"; p. 388 for "d'Euse" read "Duèse"; p. 394 for "1363" read "1353"; p. 400 for "Clement VIII" read "Clement VII"; p. 412 for "Pozzio" read "Poggio"; p. 482 for "1681" read "1689"; p. 486 for "1701" read "1721." Because of such defects the work cannot even be recommended as a reliable and handy reference book.

Writing for the general reader, Father Brusher uses a lively and graphic style. Too often, however, he descends to the use of colloquialisms that hardly accord with the dignity of his subject. Emperor Valens, e.g., and other miscreants "made it hot for the orthodox" (p. 74 and elsewhere), and other blackguards had the habit of "making life miserable" for the good popes *(passim)*. Alexander II "blasted away at abuses" (p. 308), and Honorius II "had the reputation of being crammed full of literature" (p. 322). A little later Innocent IV "hawked the Sicilian crown around Europe" (p. 356). It is also disagreeable to read about "half-cracked friars" at the time of Boniface VIII (p. 382) or "a rabble of theologians" at the Council of Basel (p. 410). Nor is it seemly to call unlikely but successful candidates in conclaves "dark horses."

The other half of the book, consisting of the illustrations selected by Mr. Emanuel Borden, requires less comment and not much more commendation. Most of the popes up to St. Sylvester I are pictured from the frescoes in the Sistine Chapel and other rooms of the Vatican; although these are not true likenesses, they are at least genuine works of art by celebrated painters such as Ghirlandaio and Botticelli. For the 152 pontiffs listed from Celestine I to John XXII, however, sixty-four portraits (including five in full color) are reproduced from the medallions in the Basilica of St. Paul outside the Walls, even though these mosaics have little artistic merit and no iconographical value. For comparatively few of the popes, in short, can the reader be surer about their real appearance than about their character and accomplishments.

ROBERT TRISCO

The Catholic University of America

Ecumenical Councils in the Catholic Church. An Historical Survey. By Hubert Jedin. (New York: Herder and Herder, Inc. 1960. Pp. v, 253. $3.95).

The scholarly career of Professor Jedin is well known to readers of this REVIEW. In his biography of Seripando (available in an abridged English edition) and his magisterial history of the Council of Trent, of which a translation is in progress, there is ample indication of the excellent caliber of the research of this talented and prolific historian. In this small book under review the author has attempted, with partial success, the very difficult task of compressing the history of the ecumenical councils into a fairly continuous essay. To interpret a series of complex theological quarrels which cannot be understood without reference to both the evolution of Catholic dogma and to contemporary events in Christian antiquity, mediaeval and modern history requires unusual talents of synthesis. In this book aimed at the general reader Father Jedin has merely offered a clear and factual summary of the results of each ecumenical council with a brief outline of the historical circumstances that prompted their convocation. Over half of the book is devoted to the later councils with the emphasis on the growth of the conciliar theory and the dogmatic achievements of Trent and the Vatican.

Unfortunately, there is very little discussion of the factors behind the Eastern Schism, but the very objective discussion of Luther and the reform period should certainly end the impression that Trent slammed the door in the face of Protestants. Occasionally the author introduces the reader to questions which he does not answer satisfactorily, e.g., the failure of the Fifth Lateran Council to propose a more sweeping reform is not adequately explained. Similarly, while political pressures are mentioned in passing as part of the background of Trent, this important and interesting factor is never shown to be curtailing the work of the assembly. The work ends with a series of reflections upon the author's basic theme of the achievement of the councils in the history of the Church. There is a good bibliographical note which describes the leading documentary collections for the study of the councils and lists of some of the excellent recent German publications which guided the author in this competent survey.

ALBERT J. LOOMIE

Fordham University

The Idea of Reform. Its Impact on Christian Thought and Action in the Age of the Fathers. By Gerhart B. Ladner. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1959. Pp. xiv, 553. $10.00.)

By whatever yardstick, this is an impressive achievement. The author quotes all the right sources, marshals a dazzling array of pertinent and even remotely allied studies, and arrives at convincing and meaningful conclusions. The over-all verdict can only be high praise—and gratification that patristic research of such calibre is appearing on the American scene.

Since the Protestant Reformation particularly, the idea of reform has most often been associated with the improvement of social bodies or of the Church as an institution. The author insists, therefore, at the very outset that "the origins of the Christian idea of reform are related to the core of evangelical and Pauline doctrine on the human person: to the experience of its newness in Christ" (p. 2). The concepts of reformation or renewal as used in Scripture and understood until the time of Gregory VII signified personal transformation into an ever more perfect realization of that "image and likeness" of God in man which had been impaired by the fall and restored by Christ, *the* Image of the Father. "And yet, in spite of the personal, individual character of the Christian idea of reform it became effective as a supra-individual force at a relatively early date, above all, but not exclusively, in monasticism" (*ibid.*). This reform is achieved basically in the sacrament of baptism, restored and deepened in penance and the Eucharist.

Such is the book's thesis. That personal rather than institutional reform dominated the thinking of the fathers is almost disconcertingly evident in the life story of a great reformer like John Chrysostom—of whom, incidentally, the author treats all too briefly. Nonetheless, it should be pointed out that the need of institutional reform was not altogeher ignored: witness the doctrinal and disciplinary decrees of Nicea and subsequent councils, whose dimensions were ecclesiological as well as personal.

The prominence given to the "image and likeness" idea as a major determinant of Christian being and ethos must be heartily welcomed. It has proved one of the richest veins of theological re-discovery of patristic thought in recent years. Concentrating on Gregory of Nyssa, as representative of the East, the author shows how this idea served to elucidate the eastern view of Christian transformation in Christ as a restoration to the state of man in paradise before the fall, and, presupposing ascetical purification of heart, as the foundation of the mystical vision of God, seen in His image (the human soul) as in a mirror. The doctrine of man's likeness to God signified his deification, his sharing in God's life, such as he enjoyed before Adam's sin. For St. Augustine, whom the author similarly highlights as chief spokesman of the West, the image of God is necessarily the image of the triune God: of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, whom baptized, "re-formed" man must henceforth strive to resemble also in proper use of "memory," intellect, and will. There is question not merely of restoration to a previous, paradisaic state but of a dynamic *reformari in melius:* the "happy fault" of the *Exsultet* is a characteristically western emphasis.

Later western stress on *efficient* causality in the work of redemption has almost totally obscured this basic patristic approach in terms of image and likeness—to our theological and spiritual impoverishment. "Exemplary causality" as usually understood according to scholastic categories cannot bear the weight of the wealth of meaning and connotation attaching scripturally and patristically to "likeness" or *mimesis*. Christ is the Image of the Father, not merely because He resembles the Father somehow, but because He truly realizes in Himself the divine Being; the restoration of man to the "likeness" of God similarly involves a true sharing in divine life, and not just morally superior behavior. The "imitation of Christ" is first of all something ontological, God's greatest gift to man, and only consequently can it become meaningful in moral terms: the gift becomes our obligation. And—merely to suggest further revenues of application—that the Eucharist is the "memorial," the *mimesis* of the last supper is the traditional manner of stating that the original ritual sacrifice is realized anew, re-activated, in a sacramental way in every Mass. If Professor Ladner's learned treatise does nothing more than help to rehabilitate the fuller import of "exemplar" and "image" as applied to Christian life and worship, it will prove of substantial significance. Actually, of course, it contains much else besides of undoubted value. Especially enlightening, e.g., is the manner in which he traces the influence of Augustinian monasticism on early mediaeval Christian life and society.

A few minor criticisms: while not quarrelling with the author's concentration on St. Gregory of Nyssa and St. Augustine, this reviewer feels that some of the other personalities in "the Age of the Fathers" might have been treated less cursorily. At the very beginning of western Latin literature, reformation according to the "image and likeness" idea plays a not unimportant role in the writings of Tertullian. In the East, Clement of Alexandria, followed by Athanasius and others, including Gregory of Nyssa, associates this idea intimately (some of them, primarily) with that of "incorruptibility" *(aphtharsia)*—which our author seems to have overlooked entirely. In the analysis of Gregory's thought, *Aszese und Mystik in der Väterzeit* by M. Viller and K. Rahner might have proved useful. There are mercifully few misprints.

GODFREY L. DIEKMANN

St. John's University
Collegeville

The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew. By Francis Dvornik. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1958. Pp. x, 342. $6.00.)

The seven chapters of this magisterial volume fall into two well defined sections. The first part (of three chapters) shows that although from the beginning, in West as well as East, Church organization was patterned upon the political structure of the Roman Empire, it was the idea of the apostolicity of an episcopal see which soon became dominant in the West, and especially at Rome, as the basis for that see's special *auctoritas.* The East, on the other hand, perhaps because so many of its bishoprics were apostolic in origin, tended to give little thought to apostolicity as the foundation for a church's prominence. Woven into this section is a good account of the rise of metropolitan and supra-metropolitan jurisdictions and a sound analysis of why it was that canon 28 of the Council of Chalcedon (451), which ranked the See of Constantinople as second to Rome without any reference to apostolicity, should have seemed so natural to eastern prelates and so reprehensible to the Roman pontiff. The third chapter depicts the growing emphasis on Rome's apostolic character in the teaching of the popes during the Acacian Schism (482-519) and the wide acceptance of this Roman contention on the part of eastern bishops and emperors at a time when Constantinople was still satisfied to find a sufficient basis for her ecclesiastical prominence in the fact that she was the capital of the empire.

Yet the imperial see would not permanently remain content with such grounds for her greatness. To the rise and expansion of an interpretation linking Constantinople (Byzantium) with the apostles, the four chapters which make up the second section of the book are devoted. It would seem that in the early fifth century talk of the apostolicity of the capital hardly meant more than that Constantinople's churches had come into possession of the relics of SS. Andrew, Luke, and Timothy. By the seventh century, however, perhaps in imitation of Rome, the imperial city was calling herself an apostolic see, while two centuries later the contention had become current that Constantinople was the heir of Ephesus and, therefore, of the Apostle John. But all the while a view was gaining ground (its basis was the third- or fourth-century apocryphal Acts of Andrew) that Stachys, first Bishop of Byzantium, had been consecrated by the Apostle Andrew. Interestingly, the Patriarch Photius does not seem to have held to this theory, for Father Dvornik argues convincingly (pp. 247-253) that the tract *Ad eos qui dicunt Roman esse primam sedem,* in which the Andrew legend appears, was not authored by Photius. Nonetheless, by the tenth century this new explanation had caught on in Constantinople and Syria and Georgia, while during the thirteenth to the sixteenth century it would win acceptance in the West. The final chapter, which spells out the diffusion of the Andrew legend, also gives a perceptive insight into how the doctrine of pentarchic authority (i.e., the theory that the Church is subject to the pope and the four eastern patriarchs conjointly), first adumbrated at the council of 680-681, grew apace during the ninth century on the basis of an apostolic principle now thought to be verifiable not only at Rome, Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, but at Constantinople as well.

Few will deny that this present work measures up to the excellence of Father Dvornik's earlier *The Photian Schism*. Like it, this is a scholar's volume which will fascinate the general reader. Perhaps, its most pleasing characteristic is its Christian irenicism, palatable to both East and West. At a period when the Roman pontiff and the ecumenical patriarch are more attuned to one another than they have been in five centuries, this study aids in understanding what stands against and what makes for rapprochement between the Old and the New Rome.

HENRY G. J. BECK

Immaculate Conception Seminary
Darlington

The Early Churches of Rome. By Emile Mâle. Translated by David Buxton (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, Inc. 1960. Text to page 169; illustrations and index to page 253. $12.50.)

Both professional scholars and interested laymen will welcome the English translation by David Buxton of Emile Mâle's *Rome et ses vieilles églises*. The translation reads as well as Mâle's lucid French. A man of great insight, Mâle here offers not so much a technical investigation of the early Roman churches, as a study of the broad prevalent historical currents, illustrated by a choice selection of these churches. Arranged in chronological order, the chapters span a period from the first Christian centuries to the thirteenth, covering such topics and monuments as the catacombs of Domitilla, the Roman house-churches, the fifth-century basilicas, the influence of the Holy Land pilgrimages, the papal reaction to iconoclasm, the Teutonic influences of Otto III, the reforms of Gregory VII, and finally the Cistercian and Dominican architectural contributions. His examination of the iconoclastic problem is exceptionally gratifying.

Certain theories of common acceptance when Mâle conducted his studies for this work are, however, no longer in favor. Hence a translator's note that the first-century date attributed to parts or persons actually associated with the catacombs of Domitilla and Priscilla no longer survives present critical analysis, would avoid propagating mistaken ideas, as the translator did for the house-church under S. Martino ai Monti (p. 45, note 2). A further contribution, lacking in this study, to Roman ecclesiastical machinery made by the Byzantine monks exiled in Rome during the eastern iconoclastic persecutions was the Roman *diaconia,* a monastic establishment of charity of eastern importation. The author's intuition about the existence of wall frescoes in the Roman *tituli* contemporary to those of the catacombs (p. 47) has been greatly bolstered by the recent discovery of the new catacomb on the *via Latina* at Rome, where certain themes, hitherto unknown to Roman Christian iconography, have appeared, but which probably had their counterparts on the walls of the earliest Roman parish churches. Likewise the semi-annular crypts examined by the author have found their prototype in the recent excavations under St. Peter's, where it was seen that Gregory the Great raised the sanctuary level to permit Mass above the Apostle's tomb, preserving easy access to the earlier shrine below.

The choice of illustrations is excellent, but certain plates lack clarity e.g., Nos. 5, 12, 13, 19, 20, 25, 56, 63. A translator's note to the effect that the separate chapters were originally lectures, then later articles, would explain much unnecessary repetition in the text itself. Despite minor objections the book is to be recommended highly. And the translator has done service to the author's memory (+1954) in rendering such a work public to an ever growing field of interested readers.

Guy Ferrari

Apostolic Vatican Library

Prester John, the Letter and the Legend. By Vsevolod Slessarev. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 1959. Pp. 127. $6.00.)

A French version of Prester John's *Letter,* printed in Paris about 1500, and now conserved in the James Ford Bell Collection of the University of Minnesota Library, forms the basis of the present volume. In addition to a facsimile reproduction and translation of the text, Slessarev offers the reader a valuable analysis of "the past and present views of this illusive sovereign and priest."

Reporting information received in 1145 from Bishop Hugh of Jabala (near Antioch), Otto of Freising was the first to record the supposed existence of Prester John, a priest-king of Nestorian Christians living somewhere beyond Persia and Armenia. Twenty years later, a letter purportedly written by this monarch was received in western Europe. Addressing himself to the Emperor of Rome and the King of France, Prester John urged them to collaborate with him in the liberation of the Holy Land. But the greater part of the letter was a description of the wonders of India and the miracles of St. Thomas. From that time the figure of Prester John attained great popularity in western Europe, and many missionaries searched fruitlessly for his kingdom. The letter was translated into several languages, including French, German, English, Serbian, Russian, and Hebrew. As political circumstances in Europe changed, new versions of the letter appeared, bringing it up to date. The *Letter* published by Slessarev is one of many examples.

Slessarev believes that the author of the original letter was a western European cleric of the twelfth century who drew on many sources, including personal knowledge of the crusader states of the Holy Land. On the much debated question of Prester John's identity, he carefully reviews various possibilities; but he insists upon the importance of Prester John's association with India, St. Thomas, and the Nestorian Christians as the key to the solution. He suggests that further investigation of popular traditions concerning St. Thomas may help to establish the existence of an historical precursor of Prester John. Slessarev's work is a distinguished contribution to the study of the legend of Prester John. His handsomely printed volume is equipped with excellent notes and an index.

JOSEPH F. O'CALLAGHAN

Fordham University

Early Franciscan Government. Elias to Bonaventure. By Rosaline Brooke. (New York: Cambridge University Press. 1959. Pp. xv, 313. $7.50.)

It was inevitable that the revisionist spirit would eventually invade the field of Franciscan history. Now that Mrs. Brooke has established a beachhead, let us hope that future attempts at reinterpretation will be as productive of happy results as her *Early Franciscan Government* which appeared last year as Volume VII (New Series) of the Cambridge Studies in Mediaeval Life and Thought.

The book is divided into two clearly designated parts, the first entitled "Brother Elias," the second "The Decisive Years: 1239-1260." Mrs. Brooke contends that a thorough knowledge of the personality and accomplishments of Brother Elias is of crucial importance for an understanding of the early history of the order. For this reason she makes his career the starting point of her investigation. It is her further contention that the transformation of the Friars Minor from a motley company of itinerant beggars into a great and elaborately organized religious order was not the work of any one man, but rather the result of the activities of that body of educated clerical ministers who accomplished the deposition of Elias, dominated the general chapters of 1239 and 1243, and framed the constitutions that were to govern the order through the succeeding centuries. It is the evolution of these constitutions which forms the subject matter of the second part of the book.

Elias of Cortona is probably the most controversial figure in the history of the Franciscan Order, his closest rival being William of Ockham. He had his defenders and his defamers, but the latter have been by far the more numerous. It should be noted, however, that the attitude displayed toward Elias in the early sources is always dependent on the date of their composition. The jaundiced view taken by most writers is traced by the author to the Spirituals, who wrote about thirteenth-century events in the light of fourteenth-century controversies. It should also be remembered that Elias' apostasy, excommunication, and conversion to the Ghibelline cause—all of which took place after he had been relieved of the office of minister general—made him a convenient scapegoat on whom the Zelanti could blame the subsequent vicissitudes of the order. The bitter exaggerations of these controversialists have infected many later writers, even such relatively modern scholars as Sabatier and Lempp, who attribute to Elias an undeserved importance in the process of the modification of the Franciscan rule.

"The chief concern of this book has been to attempt a more historical treatment of Elias, and to reach a better understanding of his personality" (p. 6). The historical treatment consists of an extremely detailed re-evaluation of the sources from Cleano to Eccleston. From this Elias emerges much less a villain than he is customarily depicted. Yet, there is no attempt at whitewashing. Mrs. Brooke's objective is not to vindicate Elias, but to do him justice. This she does, and her conclusions are so well documented that it would be difficult to controvert them. Personality interpretation, of course, is a less exact art, and here the reader may find himself in disagreement with some of the author's assertions. She holds that "Elias was, essentially, a weak man. He had no staying power" (p. 172). She feels that a modern psychologist would judge him possessed of an inferiority complex. And she is certain that, "The underlying reason for Elias' moral collapse was that he joined the Friars Minor without having a true vocation" (p. 170).

The second part of the book describes the achievements of Elias' immediate successors in the office of minister general: Albert of Pisa, Haymo of Faversham, Crescentius of Jesi, and St. Bonaventure. It was during the period of their rule that the constitutional and social lines along which the order was to develop were permanently fixed. It is Mrs. Brooke's belief that among the many who had a part in this development, Haymo of Faversham was the most influential. She would not, however, deprive St. Bonaventure of an importance sufficient to justify his title of "second founder." He was the great constructive reformer who consolidated and completed the characteristic achievement of his predecessors, thus guaranteeing the survival of that unique spirit which animates and informs the Franciscan way of life.

In her study of the early constitutional history of the order, the author is hampered by the lack of a complete copy of any set of statutes previous to the constitutions of Narbonne which were promulgated in 1260. With the aid of earlier constitutional fragments, bulls, expositions of the rule, and parallel passages from the Dominican constitutions, she attempts to reconstruct the codes of 1239 and 1242. The exactness with which she pursues this task is commendable, but in spite of her painstaking efforts a large area of darkness remains.

No one can doubt Mrs. Brooke's affection for St. Francis, but she never allows sentimentality to dull her critical acumen. Too often admirers of the founder insist on viewing him as always and inevitably in the right, incapable of faulty judgment, and endowed with all possible perfections. The saint himself would be the first to disclaim possession of such quasi-divine attributes. He truly possessed the genius of sanctity, but he "never really answered the problem of running an Order" (p. 283). If this were not the case there would be no need for studies such as *Early Franciscan Government*. Let us hope that Mrs. Brooke will favor us with other studies of the same high quality.

CYPRIAN J. LYNCH

St. Joseph's Seraphic Seminary
Callicoon, New York

A Reformation Paradox: The Condemned New Testament of the Rostock Brethren of the Common Life. By Kenneth A. Strand. (Ann Arbor: Ann Arbor Publishers. 1960. Pp. 101. $2.50.)

Four chapters (pp. 21-48) with footnotes (pp. 51-58) constitute the text of this work; the appendix (pp. 62-101) reproduces in facsimile the first twenty chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel from the only surviving complete copy of the Rostock Brethren's unfinished—it stopped with the *Acts*—Low German edition of the New Testament, preserved in the National Library of Württemberg at Stuttgart, Germany.

Luther's reaction to the Brethren's undertaking created the supposed paradox: he, the reputed champion of the Bible in German, condemns and secures the interdiction of their work. Dr. Strand, a Seventh-Day Adventist clergyman, resolves the paradox thus: Luther rejected this work not because the Brethren were producing a rival work or because they used Jerome Emser's version, which Luther claimed was substantially his own, but because he (Luther) claimed this version was "poisoned" by Emser to a significant degree with additions, glosses, and annotations.

As a backdrop the author describes the *Devotio Moderna,* the genesis of the Brethren of the Common Life, and the history of their Rostock house. Gerard Groote and Gerard Zerbolt of Zutphen are also treated. The 1529 Leipzig edition of Emser's New Testament is established as the basic source for the Brethren's version. Though the author believes the Brethren corrected Emser's version in a Lutheran sense, he grants that their version was after all still a Catholic Bible. It seems apropos to recall that there were fourteen translations of the Bible in High German and five in Low German prior to 1518.

GEORGE J. UNDREINER

Pontifical College Josephinum

The Religious Orders in England. By Dom David Knowles. Volume III, *The Tudor Age.* (New York: Cambridge University Press. 1959. Pp. xiv, 522. $10.00.)

In *The Monastic Order in England* and in the first two volumes of *The Religious Orders in England* Dom David Knowles has written the history of the English religious from the Benedictine revival associated with St. Dunstan in the tenth century to the end of the Wars of the Roses. "This volume," he writes in his preface to *The Tudor Age,* "completes a task undertaken almost exactly thirty years ago." It will come as a surprise to no one who has any acquaintance with the earlier work that the task has been completed brilliantly.

This final chapter, of course, brings to a dismal end the six centuries-long story, for the Tudor age witnessed the disappearance of monk and nun, friar and canon, who for so long had been an integral part of the English scene and had shared in every phase of English life. Even before Henry VIII contrived their destruction, the Tudor religious, heirs of a century and more of decline, had displayed the decadence which facilitated the greedy work of the king and Cromwell and which rendered their dispersal a matter of indifference to most of their countrymen. It was no doubt a decadence usually marked rather by the slackness of abated fervor than by the presence of heinous crime. But the account of it, given in the first section of Dom David's book, provides convincing proof of how deeply the rot had penetrated. As the religious ignored the strictures of Erasmus and the English adherents of the New Learning, so they failed to see the warning in the scattered suppressions of the highhanded Wolsey or in the fate of Elizabeth Barton. Out of expediency they accepted the king as Supreme Head of the Church in England, and then they had to bow to the king's own ever-present expediency, his need for funds. With only a handful of exceptions, who, like Prior Houghton and his Carthusians, light up Dom David's dark pages with the brilliance of their courage and dedication, the religious men and women of England surrendered, and a great part of the narrative of this book is devoted to the dissolution—the economic motives, the visitations, the suppression of the lesser houses and then of the greater, the dismantling of the houses, the disposal of property and personnel. The brief reign of Mary Tudor saw a kind of monastic reprise, chiefly at Westminster under the guidance of the enigmatic John Feckenham, but, as Dom David puts it, "the conception of the religious life as an occupation for a young man . . . had gone forever, and the appearance of anything like a widespread desire for the monastic life as a vocation would never be seen in England until a fresh epoch of fervor had dawned."

There is contained in this book more than one lesson for the writer of history. Of first importance is the author's knowledge and use of sources which give to his account its admirable balance and genuineness. He knows as well the vast secondary literature on this subject, with its centuries of passionate apologetic for the monks and equally passionate criticism of them; thus, without overlooking or denying the value of the work of a Gasquet or of a Coulton, he steers a moderate and judicious course between them. Finally, to read Dom David's prose, with its serenity, strength, and clarity, will bring joy to the heart of anyone who admires the English language.

This reviewer found but two points about which he might raise some question. First, the opening chapters give the impression of disconnection; each of them, indeed, is a brilliant essay in itself, but the sum of them seems not to present an integral picture. Secondly, the friars appear to receive rather less attention from Dom David than they deserve. It is quite likely that the nature of the sources determined the author's procedure in these cases and, therefore, renders the criticisms pointless. And it should be mentioned that St. Antoninus of Florence was a Dominican, not a Franciscan (pp. 11, 206). In any case this work is of such stature that it will long outlast any criticism of it. Added to the book are ten useful appendices, an impressive bibliography, and a full index, and its physical makeup is as handsome as one might expect from the Cambridge University Press.

MARVIN R. O'CONNELL

College of St. Thomas

Holy Writ or Holy Church, the Crisis of the Protestant Reformation. By George H. Tavard. (New York: Harper and Bros. 1959. Pp. x, 250. $5.00.)

Father Tavard presents an erudite and irenic treatment of a crucial issue: the problem of Christian authority. He employs a "purely historical" method in making this contribution to an "ecumenical dialogue" and in offering a way out of the Catholic-Protestant deadlock over the Scripture-tradition dilemma. Many questions arise for a Protestant reader.

According to the author, the classical Catholic theory developed during the patristic period. Authority was defined in terms of the "oneness" of Scripture and apostolic tradition, with the Church responsible for transmitting and interpreting the Gospel. There was a "co-inherence" between the Gospel and the responsible agent in handing it down: "The universal (Catholic) and institutional (ecclesiastic) Church is the norm of the tradition that keeps tradition undefiled." There was no dichotomy between Scripture and tradition in the early Church and the churches that established a written canon did so not as a norm of faith, but to "regulate a liturgical practice." This is a highly questionable position. But even if it were the case, Father Tavard has succeeded only in shifting the problem to another ground. Why did the churches establish a canon to regulate the central act of the Christian community? What is a liturgical practice if it is not the handing down of the faith, by God's grace, in the reading and receiving of the Word?

The author traces the degeneration and discord in the Church through the Middle Ages to the Reformation. He declares frankly that Christians of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries were not only caught in a "degenerate state of Church life" but also in the "whirlwind of a theological decadence." Luther and Calvin were among those who reacted. Luther, according to this interpretation, measured everything by "his gospel," namely, justification by faith. It is, however, stretching a point, and ignoring the breadth of Luther's biblical insight, to imply that in so doing he adopted a "righteousness of doctrine." His supposed rejection of ecclesiastical authority was not so much rejection as it was an attempt to reassess and re-evaluate the authority of the councils, the pope, and the canons. In dealing with Calvin, the author emphasizes the "secret operation" of the Spirit, and a conception of the Church determined by the logic of predestination. Calvin's basic point, which is muted in this treatment, was that the Church does not possess, but is possessed by, the Word and Spirit. The Spirit gives continuity and continuous life to the body of Christ, through preaching, through the administration of the sacraments, and, although the author denies it, through the discipline of those weak in the faith. The Reformation dilemma was not "Holy Writ *or* Holy Church." A canon of Scripture was established in the patristic period in order to measure the faithfulness and fulness of the witness of the Church to its Lord. Tavard suggests that of all reformers the English of the "Elizabethan way" were on the right track.

The classical position on authority, however, was maintained "here and there in spite of the trends of the times." Out of the "chaos" came the ultimate "serenity" of the Tridentine statements, "structurally distinct, yet theologically equivalent" to the patristic viewpoint, according to Father Tavard. He is to be commended for the delineation of the many factions speaking and maneuvering for place at Trent. He is to be questioned about the ease with which he proves that the council "reasserted" the scriptural principle as it had been held in the early Church. Of course, Father Tavard stated his conclusion in his introduction, namely, that he accepts Christian authority as interpreted in the decrees of the sixteenth-century council, and more recently in those of the Vatican. He is subject, therefore, to the same criticism he levels at Luther, that "the conclusion of the argument was included in its premise." This book highlights a weakness of centering Protestant-Catholic discussion in the Reformation-Counter Reformation period, without due reference to subsequent history. What, e.g., are apostolic traditions? Trent did not say, although Tavard claims in his interpretation that the Church's faith "includes" them. And granting the responsibility of the Church for *actus tradendi,* has the selection and development of tradition and dogma in the Roman Catholic Church been homogeneous or heterogeneous?

But, of course, this is the heart of the problem. Father Tavard has done a service in defining the issue for us so well, and in stating it so clearly.

JAMES H. SMYLIE

Princeton Theological Seminary

The Riddle of Roman Catholicism. Its History, its Beliefs, its Future. By Jaroslav Pelikan. (New York-Nashville: Abingdon Press. 1959. Pp. 272. $4.00.)

Roman Catholicism, the author advises his readers, is here to stay. It, therefore, behooves Protestants to study it as something likely to be encountered more and more often in coming years. Among the younger Protestant theologians making their way to distinction in scholarship and service is Dr. Pelikan, professor of historical theology in the Federated Theological Faculty of the University of Chicago. A Lutheran minister, co-editor of *Luther's Works,* he reflects on the American scene the remarkable rapproachement that has brought his co-religionists and Catholics together in present-day Germany in the search for what unites them theologically. "This volume," says the author, "is written from the standpoint of a theology which has its roots in the Reformation and which therefore—not nevertheless—feels obligated to take the Church of Rome seriously."

It is obvious that Dr. Pelikan has, indeed, taken the Church of Rome seriously. Despite the somewhat ambiguous title, this is a fairminded and thorough effort by an outsider to explain to his fellow Protestants what it is that makes up the Catholic Church. For, as he says, to most Protestants the Church is "part photograph, part old daguerreotype and part caricature." This is the Church, we are reminded, described by Macaulay as characterized by ". . . a complete subjection of reason to authority, a weak preference of form to substance, a childish passion for mummeries, an idolatrous veneration for the priestly character, and above all, a merciless intolerance. " This book is almost a point-by-point antidote to Macaulay's influence.

In the first of three main sections, the author describes the historical evolution of Roman Catholicism, and particularly the fortunes of the Church since the Reformation until modern times. The second section contains an exposition and critique of some specific features of the inner life of the Church which most mystify or repel Protestants: the authority of the Church, the Church-State relationship, the sacramental system, Mariology, Thomism, and the liturgy. A final section enters upon the more strictly theological arena with a discussion of the four marks of the Church, conversion as a two-way street, and the ecumenical prospects of interfaith relations. This reviewer got the impression that the heart of the writer's interest and concern is expressed in this third section.

It would not be possible to take up in this space the individual issues raised by Dr. Pelikan. Every page bears the stamp of originality and freshness. There are no clichés here. The Catholic, even while disagreeing with some of the interpretations of history or practice or dogma, must often pause for thought and reflection. In the end, he will understand his own religion a little better, having seen it for once through the eyes of a sympathetic but analytic Protestant. Not the least of the services rendered by the author is his exemplification of the frank but respectful way Catholics and Protestants should write and speak about each other's beliefs and practices. It would be nice to see a similar book by a Catholic theologian entitled, "The Riddle of Protestantism."

The fully annotated bibliography, we suspect, will be of great use to the Protestant reader. This instrument of better Catholic-Protestant understanding won the 1959 Abingdon Award. A sign of the times?

ROBERT A. GRAHAM

Campion House
New York

Der Karmelitengeneral Nikolaus Audet und die Katholische Reform des XVI. Jahrhunderts. By Adrianus Staring, O.Carm. (Rome: Institutum Carmelitanum. 1959. Pp. xxxii, 492.)

As other religious orders, e.g. the Franciscans, the Jesuits, etc., have done, the Carmelites are now also editing documentary and archival texts and studies pertaining to their community. The present work marks the third volume of the series. As is well known, the Carmelite Order today embraces two distinct families, that of the Ancient Observance (O.Carm.) and that of the Discalced Carmelite Fathers (O.C.D.). The book in questions deals with a minister general of the first category, but of the still undivided order, Nicholas Audet (ca. 1480-1562), honored by many as a saintly person (cf. *Lex. für Theologie und Kirche,* 1st ed., I, 786). This study treats his reform activities as minister general (1523-62) and his salutary influence at the Council of Trent, especially during its first period, in the various committees and sessions pertaining to the sacred Scriptures (canon, vulgate), original sin, justification, assurance of grace, and the sacraments. In the reform section of the council, Audet particularly defended the right of religious to preach and spoke on the nature of such preaching.

The work is based entirely on documentary evidence. The fact that up to the present, if one except a doctoral dissertation at the Gregorian University, Rome, by Luigi Poliseno, O.Carm., in 1949, so little was known of this holy and learned general, made a study of him almost imperative. He seems to have been entirely overshadowed by that other great reformer of the Carmelite Order, St. Teresa of Avila. The author gives an excellent bibliography of printed works dealing either directly or indirectly with Audet (pp. ix-xv), and a large list of unpublished manuscripts to be found in European (including English) archives and libraries (pp. xv-xxii).

After a pertinent introduction, the author divides his work into eight chapters dealing with Audet's youth (he was born on the Island of Cyprus); schisms in the Carmelite Order; difficulties with the reformed Congregation of Mantua; apostates and heresies; Audet's participation in the Council of Trent; his last years, death, and evaluation. Original documents are included in three appendices. Due to the philosophical evaluation of the times (cf. e.g., pp. 330 ff.) the book is a valuable contribution as well to the history of the Carmelite Order as to that of the Catholic Reformation. The type (in Latin characters) is clear and easily legible.

The specific value of the book lies in the fact that it has brought to the fore a man so little known beyond his own order; and even there, perhaps, not sufficiently appreciated. In his long article on the Carmelite Order in the *Catholic Encyclopedia* (I, 354-370) Benedict Zimmerman, O.D.C., e.g., never even once refers to him. Only once is he otherwise mentioned in the same *Catholic Encyclopedia*, and that in connection with an article on "Rites" where it speaks of him briefly in connection with the Carmelite ordinal that he approved (XIII, 73 a.). But, as both Zimmerman (*op. cit.*, I, 354) and Staring, the author (p. xxiv) admit, Carmelite historians were more intent on proving the Elias' and Eliseus' origin of the Carmelite Order than in recording its contemporary history and thus "neglected almost completely the history of their own times" (Zimmerman, *l. c.*). The present work fills this gap to a great extent and should prove an inspiration to the covering of other apparently neglected periods of the order's existence.

RAPHAEL M. HUBER

St. Anthony-on-Hudson

The Lives of Ange de Joyeuse and Benet Canfield. By Jacques Brousse. Edited by T. A. Birrell. (New York: Sheed and Ward. 1959. Pp. xxxvi, 183. $4.50.)

The subjects of this study are two Capuchin friars caught up in the confusion of France's religious wars. Their story was first told in 1621 by Jacques Brousse and then translated into English by Robert Rookwood. The Rookwood translation is now newly edited by Anthony Birrell with annotations and extensive notes that supply historical background. Both figures had highly contrasting careers. Henri de Joyeuse, third son of the lieutenant-general for the king in Languedoc, came from a family of position, conspicuous for loyalty to the crown and for earnest Catholicism. Notwithstanding his quick rise in prestige, which brought him the sister of the Duke of Èpernon for his wife, and the governorship of Anjou, Touraine, Maine, and Perche, he possessed a fundamental unworldliness. A month after his wife's death in 1587, he settled his affairs, made provision for his daughter, and at the age of twenty-four entered the Capuchin convent of Saint-Honoré adjoining the Tuileries. Due to the swift turn of political events, it is not surprising to see Friar Angel back in political affairs. The infant French Capuchin province had been established under the patronage of Catherine de Medici and furthered through the favor of Cardinal Lorraine and Henri III, who himself took the habit of a Capuchin tertiary in 1585. His affiliation with this trusted order added to his qualifications as the new Governor of Languedoc. After the Edict of Nantes in 1598 he returned to the cloister and spent his remaining years expanding the area of Capuchin influence, twice as a provincial. Friar Canfield (William Fitch), on the other hand, had his origins among the landed gentry of Essex, a Calvinistic, Puritan background that persisted after his conversion in his somewhat joyless writings. After being received into the Church in 1586 by an old priest imprisoned at Gatehouse, he left England and became a fellow novice of Friar Angel. He returned to the English mission and spent most of his years in the prisons of the Tower, the Clink, Wisbeck Castle, and Framlingham Castle. In 1603 he was banished to France. It was during his years of imprisonment that he did much of his writing, especially the *Rule of Perfection,* which was placed on the Index due to the pressures of the Quietist controversies.

This is Baroque hagiography at its most typical. There are the over-rich declamations, extensive periods, and the lyricism that succeeds in forming not a portrait of a holy man, but a general pattern of holiness. Birrell has wisely not attempted to reduce the translation into modern idiom, since in spite of this florid seventeenth-century expression, both friars seem to live again amidst the court heroics of their troubled careers.

EDWARD D. MCSHANE

Alma College

L'Interdetto di Venezia del 1606 e i Gesuiti. Silloge di documenti con introduzione. By Pietro Pirri, S.I. (Rome: Institutum Historicum S.I. 1959. Pp. xv, 409.)

Historians have become increasingly aware in the last few years that the quarrel between Paul V and the Venetian Republic in 1606 was of much greater historical significance than the issues immediately involved would seem to indicate. In some ways it was an anachronism—on the part of the pope in supposing that an already fully discredited spiritual weapon could be effective against even a secondary power, and on the part of the Venetian *Giovani* in supposing that they could break the Spanish hegemony in Italy seventy-five years after Pavia by restoring the vitality of the republic a century after Agnadello. At the same time the quarrel was prophetic of events to come; for what Venice did in the early seventeenth century would be repeated, albeit for different reasons and on a much larger scale, by most of the other Catholic states of Europe in the mid-eighteenth century. Yet so far one of the most important results of the quarrel has been almost completely overlooked: the expulsion of the Jesuits, which Gaetano Cozzi, in his brilliant biography of Nicolò Contarini (1958) mentions only in passing, and which Hubert Becher, in a recent history of the society, merely lists in an appended chronology. A quick reading of the many well-annotated and hitherto unknown documents from the Roman archives of the Society of Jesus published in this volume will suggest first of all that the Jesuits had no part in precipitating the quarrel, for the interdict apparently caught both the general in Rome and the fathers in the Veneto completely by surprise. Secondly, it will suggest that all their activities during the crisis were directed toward bringing about a reconciliation—some completely fruitless, like the efforts of Possevino to placate the pope, and others more effective than has hitherto been recognized, like the negotiations of Coton with Henry IV. It will suggest finally that the Jesuits were the principal victims of the interdict, which they alone of all the Venetian clergy chose to obey. The papacy lost nothing but prestige; but they lost everything—their schools, churches, extensive properties, and the thousands of souls committed to their care. As a reward for the unquestioning devotion to the Holy See, indeed, and for the numerous acts of quiet heroism by the young and old, healthy and infirm, who were packed off with but a few hours notice ("et undique augustiae, foris pugnae, intus timores," p. 97), Father General Aquaviva was forced to consent "voluntarily" to the permanent exclusion of the society from Venetian territory, a concession which the editor insists Paul V need not have made (p. 55).

Why such sacrifices and why such suffering? Unfortunately, the explanation given in the lengthy introduction does not completely agree with those offered by other students of the question. According to Father Pirri, the crisis arose because of the "subtle and malicious" machinations of Sarpi to introduce Protestantism into the Veneto and because of the efforts of the "worshippers of the omnipotence of the Republic" and the "young patricians obsessed with politics" to wipe out any impediment to their political authority. According to Cozzi, on the other hand, the *Giovani* were inspired as much by religious as by political ideals. They were disciples not of Machiavelli but of Gaspare Contarini and the spiritual leaders of the Tridentine reform. They opposed further extension of ecclesiastical property, not because of greed, but because they feared that "the temporalism of the Church would darken the light of

Christianity" (Cozzi, p. 111) in a country where it had burned so brightly. And they interfered with the collection of tithes because they could not admit the justice of permitting the bishops—and the Jesuits—to shove off the entire burden of taxation onto the lower clergy. It was not the "low level of religious spirit" (Pirri, p. 6), then, but the "state of fervid devotion" among Venetians that led them to support the state. It was in the hope of stimulating, not of undermining, Catholicism that Sarpi favored the toleration of religious dissent. And it was the desire to eliminate once and for all those men determined to resist the spiritual, as well as the economic and political decay of the commonwealth that provoked the unexpected, and wholly unsuccessful action of Paul V. (Cozzi, p. 101), and not a concern for the two priests imprisoned according to long established judicial procedures. It may be unfair, to be sure, to expect Pirri to have resolved such wide differences in interpretation, for he is apparently unfamiliar with the studies of Hubert Jedin and of Luigi Salvatorelli as well as those of Cozzi, and he cites nothing published later than 1938 in the bibliography. Yet it is strange that after editing Castorio's testimony on how "in the streets and squares people began to speak ill of us, saying that we were Spaniards . . ." (p. 95), he should attribute the expulsion of the Jesuits simply to the desire of the Venetian senate "to inflict on Paul V a burning wound just where it would hurt the most" (p. 48). It will be interesting to see what use Tacchi Venturi makes of these documents when, and if, he brings his monumental *Storia della Compagnia di Gesù in Italia* down to the seventeenth century.

ERIC W. COCHRANE

University of Chicago

A Pearl to India. The Life of Roberto de Nobili. By Vincent Cronin. (London: Rupert Hart-Davis. 1959. Pp. 297. 25 s.)

The essential elements of Christianity are so few and simple that they may be contained in a vest-pocket catechism and grasped by a child. This is why in the beginning Christianity could adapt itself naturally and easily to compatible traits of peoples and cultures receiving it. So it had happened in Palestine, in Greece, in the Middle East, and in the West. But in the course of time the essentials gave rise to disciplines and sciences, to customs and rites, to formality and tradition that eventually obscured in the mind of many the clear distinction between essentials and unessentials, and in the end made people loath adaptation in things unessential as if it were a compromise with orthodoxy. As a result, it often happened that the Christian gospel was spread in various lands according to the form become traditional in the West, and hence as often it found no acceptance. This was precisely the situation in India when the Jesuit, Roberto de Nobili, landed in 1606.

In this biography de Nobili is portrayed as the product of the Italian Renaissance, a youth endowed with a brilliant mind and sterling character determined to open India's door to Christianity through a long and strenuous process of Indianization. Accordingly, with the support of enlightened superiors he began his experiment by adopting the way of life of a high caste Brahmin master; he made compatible use of the caste system and of local customs; he studied the Vedas and quoted them in his discourses and books to present the word of God in Indian terms; and he exemplified his teaching by the behavior of a saint. Prevented by Indian conventions from reaching the lower castes, he introduced an order of pandaraswamis, religious teachers corresponding to the pandarams of the Śūdra caste who could speak to Brahmins, Rājās, and Vaiśyas and yet associate with polluting castes, and thus he made the spread of the faith possible between all castes. The experiment was risky and entailing total dedication, but it was worth trying.

Almost everything is praiseworthy in this book: good paper and type, a practical map of India, a sparkling literary style, sound research and scholarship, a handy list of books by de Nobili, an ample bibliography, and an adequate index. The text is free of references and notes, which are given in a section apart at the end of the book. The few minor misprints never make the text unclear, and may be easily corrected by the reader himself e.g.: Tor de' Specchi (p. 22); Dios (p. 45); Cataluña (p. 50); Monte Cassino (p. 223); and Brandolini's entries (p. 273) may be checked against *Bibliotheca missionum* (VI, 72, 79). Opposition and censure against Indianization are outlined on pages 156, 224-230. A leading role in support of de Nobili's experiment was played by Archbishop Peter Lombard, a consultor of the Holy Office, the same gentleman who in 1616 headed the board of eleven consultors to judge and condemn Galileo Galilei's heliocentric theory as erroneous in faith. This related, the author remarks: "Fortunately Lombard, if no astronomer, knew his theology. In fact, he was an excellent choice to settle so thorny a problem" (p. 224). However, if one should judge Lombard's theology by his opinion on Galilei's orthodoxy, he would come to the opposite conclusion. For it is crystal clear that Galilei based his theory on arguments from astronomy; that, in the face of an opposition hurling biblical arguments against his astronomical theory, he maintained that the work of God, creation, with its orderly disposition and movements, ought to enjoy pre-eminence in a matter of astronomical fact over the word of God, the Bible, which had been written in popular rather than scientific terms and, therefore, could not always be taken literally. It is sufficient to peruse Galilei's letter to Elia Diodati of January 15, 1633 (XV, 24-25) in the national edition of Galilei's *opera omnia.* But this remark is only incidental to the main issue, and makes the situation and the book the more interesting.

ANTONIO SISTO ROSSO

Collegio di San Antonio
Rome

Mary Ward, 1585-1645. By Mary Oliver, I.B.V.M. (New York: Sheed and Ward. 1959. Pp. xx, 229. $3.75).

Only slightly fictionized, as in the reconstruction of some conversations, this fascinating account of a great woman is based on earlier biographies and on Mother Ward's own records. The volume is enriched by an introduction and epilogue from the perceptive mind and facile pen of Maisie Ward. The author, Mother Mary Oliver, is a spiritual daughter of Mary Ward, who in the seventeenth century founded the Institute of the Blessed Virgin Mary, devoted chiefly to the education of young girls. Pope Pius XII hailed her also as one of the early exponents of the lay apostolate.

Mary Ward's childhood and early youth were spent in the happy household of her father, Sir Marmaduke Ward, which was an oasis in the England of Elizabeth and James, where the penal laws against Catholics were brutally enforced. Believing that it was her vocation to enter a religious order on the continent, she chose the Poor Clares, realizing before long, however, that she was called instead to the lonely, difficult, and frequently misunderstood work of a pioneer. Only gradually was the precise nature of her destiny revealed to her. Then came the terrifying experiences so common to such chosen souls. Enemies sprang up who regarded her as a dangerous innovator. Counted among them were a number of secular priests, some Jesuits, canon lawyers, and even suspicious lay compatriots whose minds had been warped by protracted persecution. And—not to be discounted—were the anti-feminists of her day, who were shocked that the English Ladies, as they were often called, were not "enclosed," and that they wished their order to be governed not by bishops, but by a mother general. "Mary," writes Mother Oliver, "was the victim of a genuine seventeenth century witchhunt."

Her many friends were unable to triumph over her persistent adversaries, and, in spite of the number and success of her far-flung schools, the institute, of which each house was a part, was suppressed by a reluctant pope in 1631. Urban VIII did not know that she was soon declared a heretic by the Inquisition and imprisoned in one filthy room. When the news reached him he ordered her immediate release, and as soon as she and her party were able to come to Rome he gave them the hospitality of the Eternal City. In time the institute itself was restored to favor in accordance with the designs of its foundress, who, three centuries after her death, was to be described by Pope Pius XII as "that incomparable woman."

GEORGIANA MCENTEE

Hunter College

Christianity in a Revolutionary Age: A History of Christianity in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries. Volume I: *The Nineteenth Century in Europe. Background and the Roman Catholic Phase.* By Kenneth Scott Latourette. (New York: Harper & Bros. 1958. Pp. xiv, 498. $6.00.)

Kenneth Scott Latourette is internationally known for his monumental *History of the Expansion of Christianity,* which marked a new stage in the writing of missionary history. Now that he has reached the age of retirement, the professor emeritus of Yale has gone back to work with renewed ardor and has undertaken the task of writing a general history of Christianity in the past 150 years, the period during which Christianity has been seriously challenged for the first time since the end of the ancient world, but likewise the period during which for the first time in history it has become a "world-wide" religion. The author intends to reconsider in a broader perspective the paradox which he has already set forth in his preceding work: if on the one hand Christianity seems to be in decline in the old world, where until now it has displayed its greatest vitality, on the other hand "Christianity had never been so widely influential as it became in the twentieth century. Although by no means dominant, its influence upon mankind as a whole was growing." We have here, then, a historical study, objectively carried out, but supported by the reflexion of a Christian thinker.

Just as in his first work, the author, who is a Baptist, endeavors to write this history in a broadly ecumenical perspective, giving to each of the great Christian denominations the place which actually belongs to it in the religious history of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. But at the same time he makes it a point, following the tendency which is becoming more and more common among church historians and is the only acceptable one, not to limit himself to the history of ecclesiastical institutions or of the relations between Church and State in the various countries, but to present Christianity in all its dimensions—religious, theological, and social—and also to follow closely the double movement of the action of the surrounding milieu on the churches and of Christianity itself on the political, social, and cultural development of humanity.

The project, which Professor Latourette has prepared by extensive travel and reading, will comprise five volumes. The first two will trace the destinies of Catholicism, Protestantism, and Orthodoxy in Europe to 1914; the third will describe the spread of Christianity in the other parts of the world during the same period; and the last two will take up the history of Christianity in the world since World War I. The first volume contains two parts: the storm of revolution in Europe, and the Catholic Church from 1815 to 1914. The pages on the Revolution and its antecedents are doubly interesting—first because of the continual comparisons that he draws between the Catholic and Protestant reactions (the latter being both more flexible and more dangerous), and secondly because Professor Latourette, being an American writer, is not affected by the complexes which often becloud the vision of European historians in this field. He sees in the Revolution a consequence of the principles of the Gospel regarding human dignity; hence he is led to ask the question: since the Revolution, the product of the Gospel message, has entailed a profound dechristianization, must we conclude that Christianity bears within itself the seed of its own destruction? The work as a whole, which will show that the vitality of Christianity is more creative than ever, will furnish important elements of the answer, but one may note already that the dechristianization brought about by the Revolution threatened principally a form of Christianity affected with sclerosis and partly unfaithful to its essential principles of charity and justice.

The titles of the chapters in the second half of the book, dedicated to the remarkable recovery of the Catholic Church, which was practically dying at the dawn of the nineteenth century, illustrate the author's method, by which he seeks to go beyond events as such and to discern the great currents: the growth in power of the papacy in the Church (a papacy which, as the author does not hesitate to recognize, was purified and spiritualized in comparison with the *ancien régime*); the strengthening of the Catholic Church by the revival of the old religious orders and the emergence of new congregations, associations, and movements intended to meet the needs of the times; worship and devotional life; and the intellectual response of the Catholic Church to the revolution of the nineteenth century. It is only after this that he casts a rapid glance at the situation and the vicissitudes of the Church in particular countries, especially from the politico-religious point of view.

The author was not able to make a direct contact with the sources, or even (with some exceptions) with the pertinent monographs. As a result his exposition at times appears somewhat too schematic, but the twenty pages of bibliography and the numerous footnotes show that he is quite familiar with the general works, Catholic as well as non-Catholic, and has made ample use of them. He cites mostly books in English, as is normal in view of the public for whom he is writing; but there are sometimes disadvantages in this practice, not only because a certain number of Catholic works in English are influenced more than the corresponding works in French or German by apologetical preoccupations, but also because they are not always the most recent, e.g., the articles in the *Catholic Encyclopedia* which the author frequently quotes, were excellent when they were written but are not always up to date after half a century. A more thorough use of Schnabel's *Deutsche Geschichte im XIX. Jahrhundert,* Volume IV, *Die religiösen Kräfte,* would have enabled him to add a number of nuances to the picture of the Catholic revival in Germany during the first half of the nineteenth century, and the works of Geiselmann on the School of Tübingen and on Sailer would have helped to show the manifold fecundity of Catholic thought at this period. He has not taken sufficient notice of the many recent publications on the Italian Catholic movement under Leo XIII and Pius X which throw a new light on certain aspects of social Catholicism. The role of Döllinger and of La Mennais in the origins of the European Catholic movement of the nineteenth century, although often minimized by Catholic apologists, ought to be emphasized more, for it was really essential. Dom Oliver Rousseau's history of the liturgical movement would have enabled him to develop the paragraph on page 358, which is hardly longer than that devoted to the relations of Catherine Emmerich. The role of the Catholic parties in Germany, Belgium, and the Netherlands, as well as in France at the time of Montalembert, could have been given greater stress.

A few other details might be made more exact. It is an exaggeration to say what Gregory XVI "endorsed the validity" of the vision of Regensburg (p. 265). Pius IX always rejected the neo-Guelph dream of an Italian federation presided over by the pope (p. 267). With regard to the Syllabus, it would have been desirable to note that it was the moderate interpretation set forth by Dupanloup which rapidly gained acceptance except in some extremist circles (p. 278). The camerlingo need not reside in Rome (p. 294). Under Leo XIII there was in Belgium no alternation of Catholic and liberal governments, but six years of liberal government followed by thirty years of Catholic government (p. 302); relations with the Holy See were not broken off three times but only once; and Leo XIII regretted that the episcopate was too intransigent in its resistance to liberal measures concerning education. The German "Piusverein" was not a "pious association" but an association placed under the patronage of Pius IX (p. 346). Blondel was a professor of philosophy, not of theology (p. 387); and modernism had practically no adherents in Belgium or Holland, contrary to the statement of Houtin, who presents a much less objective picture of the movement as a whole than does Rivière.

But remarks of this kind, by which the reviewer, conforming to tradition, points out certain inaccuracies, should not lead one to mistake the value of the work as a whole. Its value is great—first, because of the impartiality of which the author continually gives proof in regard to a Church to which he does not belong, both in his material presentation of the facts and in his discriminating evaluation of them. It is rare to find a study of the Catholic Church, made from the outside, which reveals a similar sympathetic understanding. The work is valuable, moreover, because of the effort at a synthesis which has been made and which—even if one judges the outcome incomplete in certain respects—results in many extremely stimulating observations from which every historian of the Catholic Church will be able to derive ideas with great profit. The conclusion (pp. 463-468) is particularly interesting in this regard, but throughout the volume the reader will meet judicious and subtle comments with which he will not always agree but which are always intelligent and inspired by the desire to pass beyond narrow confessionalism in order to rediscover the basic Christian point of view.

ROGER AUBERT

The Catholic University of Louvain

Revolution und Kirche. Studien zur Frühgeschichte der Christlichen Demokratie (1789-1850) By Hans Maier. (Freiburg im Breisgau: Rombach & Co. 1959. Pp. 249.)

"Revolution and Church" is the general title given to a collection of studies on the early history of Christian democracy up to 1850. The revolution the author has in mind is the French Revolution of 1789, and the Christian democracy the author means is the one of La Mennais and Buchez. However, the starting point of the book is an analysis of Christian democracy in Europe since World War. II. Since this leaves wide open a gap for the period 1850-1945, the reader might well ask: what is the connection between La Mennais and Chancellor Adenauer? The Christian democracy of the middle of the nineteenth century belongs to the history of ideas; the Christian democracy of Bidault and Adenauer belongs also to political sociology.

Dr. Maier is interested in the history of ideas and the plan of the book reveals a dialectical turn of mind: 1) The revolutionary fusion of democracy and Church (1789-1794); 2) The contradiction of the tradionalists (1795-1829); 3) Liberal Catholicism and Christian democracy (1830-1850). The dialectical link between the three facts could be summed up: revolution, reaction, reconciliation. This again applies to the history of ideas, for the Church reconciled itself with the State, if not with the

Revolution, long before Catholic thinkers launched the idea of Christian democracy.

One cannot help feeling that only the third and last part of Dr. Maier's book answers the purpose he had in mind, viz., an investigation of "the origin and intellectual foundations of the Christian Democratic parties of Europe" (p. 7). The first two parts on the relationship between Church and State during the Revolution, as well as the ideas of the reactionary thinkers of the post-revolutionary period, are useful only as a general background or by contrast. What remains is relevant: a survey—a literary survey—of the life and works of La Mennais and Buchez. La Mennais, a Breton, a nobleman and a priest is well known to the student of French letters. Buchez is more obscure, though he was a profilic writer; he published a forty-volume parliamentary history of the French Revolution to prove that the Revolution was nothing but "réalisation sociale de la morale chrétienne." Is this the link between revolution and social democracy? Indeed, it could be argued that French social democracy in the past has been wrestling with one problem: the French Revolution.

A twenty-page bibliography proves the painstaking care of the author in preparing his doctoral dissertation. This work will certainly help the German reader to become acquainted with many valuable studies in religious history, a field which has seen a great activity since the war, particularly in France, where even now several important theses are being prepared. A word of criticism is in order. Why should Dr. Maier imply at the beginning of his book that the Church and social democracy are one and the same thing? It may appear to be so today, but let us not forget that La Mennais died unreconciled with the Church and that Buchez was never a practicing Catholic. In more recent days, Marc Sangnier and the *Sillon* were condemned by Rome. The early Christian democrats in France finally were not in conflict with the Revolution but with the Church. It shows that the history of Christian democracy in France cannot be approached in terms of *Kulturkampf*.

GEORGE BONNIN

St. Anthony's College
Oxford

Vatican Diplomacy. A Study of Church and State on the International Plane. By Robert A. Graham, S.J. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1959. Pp. xii, 442. $7.50.)

This reviewer is a non-Catholic, trained as a lawyer and political scientist, who for more years than he cares to remember has been preparing a comprehensive study of United States relations with the Vatican, 1783-1960. These characteristics more or less define what I can appropriately say about Father Graham's superb volume, *Vatican Diplomacy*. Not being a student of canon law, I cannot speak about the author's treatment of this topic. Being at best only an amateur European historian, I cannot discourse on Father Graham's confident tour through almost 1,000 years of European political and diplomatic events. Having digested only enough history of the papacy to dissipate my innocence, I am equally without competence to rate the author's survey of papal actions and motivations during this millennium. As to each of these matters, however, I can remark that I savoured Father Graham's presentation with a sense of being in sure and intellectually skillful hands in every chapter.

Happily for my usefulness as a reviewer, Father Graham's book is not quite what its name implies. This is not an account of the substance of papal diplomacy, in the manner of a history of a nation's foreign policy; nor is it primarily a discussion of the mechanisms by which Vatican diplomacy is made, either in the breathless anecdotal fashion of the Rome press correspondent or the ponderous style of those seeking to render into table-of-organization simplicity what remains probably the most individualistic, anachronistic, and subtle foreign office in the world. Rather, as its sub-title clearly explains, the volume is "A Study of Church and State on the International Plane." Put another way, it is an inquiry into the development of, reasons for, and problems associated with diplomatic relations between the Holy See and nation-states, both the right of "active legation" by which the Holy See sends out nuncios and of "passive legation" under which it receives diplomats at the Vatican.

The most original sections of Father Graham's volume are his accounts of the origins of the missions sent to the pope during the years of the Papal States by nations such as France, Great Britain, Prussia, Belgium, Russia, and the United States. Painstakingly reconstructed through a search of archives in more than a half dozen European chancellories, the story of these missions is then traced through the crisis of 1870, the "tests" of two world wars, and the new cold war atmospheres. In no other volume can a reader find this told with such an attention to detail and freedom from minutiae. If the section on United States relations prior to 1939 is the least documented and least explored of the lot, it is probably because Father Graham chose to focus closely on the Myron Taylor phase. On this, he contributes a discussion of prospects and perils attached to American relations with the Holy See which is both careful and insightful. When the inside story of the Myron Taylor and Mark Clark episodes is published and the private presidential-papal communications are disclosed, Father Graham will be one commentator who will not have to revise his commentary.

In his concluding chapter the author re-states the theses which he has been led to: that the Catholic Church and nation-states have never been entirely separated "in the sense that either wished"; that Vatican diplomacy has become an accepted institution "even in those circles not at all suspect of partiality to the Holy See"; that the attempt to assign diplomatic relations to the entity of the State of Vatican City is "difficult to reconcile with the data of history"; that "liberty is the acid test of sovereignty" and Vatican diplomacy can best be understood "in terms of liberty [for the Church] rather than in terms of sovereignty"; that "the Holy See was able to break loose from its bonds in the very century of the much-denounced liberal State and in large part, thanks to the principles of that liberal State" and "Church history needs rewriting from that point of view"; and that if the modern State "must accept a dual loyalty on the part of its citizens," it is appropriate that it send diplomatic representatives for mutual interests "to the only religious authority which affords peremptory guidance to consciences."

To describe these provocative themes, and to testify that Father Graham makes a powerful case in support of them, is to say, in other words, that this is a book which must be read.

ALAN F. WESTIN

Columbia University

Church and Parliament: The Reshaping of the Church of England, 1828-1860. By Olive J. Brose. (Stanford: Stanford University Press. 1959. Pp. vi, 239. $5.00.)

This is an important book. In addition to its discussion of the changing relationship between Church and State in the years 1828-1860, this volume features thoughtful essays on the Irish Church settlement, the church policies of Sir Robert Peel and Bishop Blomfield, the issue of religious education, and the relation between religion and the larger currents of public opinion.

Two major events between 1828 and 1832—the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts and Roman Catholic Emancipation, and the Reform Bill of 1832—served notice of the coming-of-age of liberalism and democracy. Observers of the pre-Reform Bill violence were quick to notice that the agitation had a social and economic side, as well as a political and anti-clerical one. For the Church, the bill signified that a shift of major proportions was taking place in the traditional Church-State relations; for the churchmen, this was a sign that the Church's long overdue internal reform would be one of its consequences. The effort of opponents of the Church to take advantage of their new power to push toward disestablishment in turn forced churchmen to reassess their position and to make plans for the continuation of the establishment. The fundamental problem of this book is the analysis of the shifting relationship between Church and State. Professor Brose is to be commended for her unusually fine job in tracing the context within which this changing relationship had to be worked out; in discussing the administrative changes made and "their intimate relation both to the patterns of thought prevailing in government at the time, and to similar patterns within the Church and within society at large"; and in showing how that relationship was maintained and what techniques were developed for its practical operation.

Sir Robert Peel and Bishop Blomfield were the political and ecclesiastical architects of the program and the strategy by which the Church met the challenge to its property, privilege, and utility. Peel realized that to slow down the progress of radicalism, the Conservative opposition must adopt a program of constructive reform. By 1833, moreover, it became clear that the Irish Church question was the one upon which Peel should build his strategy. With his utilitarian approach to this issue Peel was able to split the Whigs, to offer a constructive program to the ultra-Tories within his party, and to give Blomfield a solid foundation for his ecclesiastical reforms. In addition, he had found a viable issue to take to the electorate. In the process, he helped bring into being a popular opinion which bridged the gap between the House of Commons and the House of Lords. This climate of opinion also buttressed the position of the Church, furnishing the needed time in which the necessary administrative reforms could be carried out.

There is a peculiar ambivalence in the patterns of thought that Professor Brose explores. While she emphasizes the Benthamite utilitarian considerations which often colored Blomfield's and Peel's decisions, at the same time her book reveals the extent to which essentially moral and religious values characterized the frame of reference of the post-Reform Bill period. Much more, of course, remains to be done along these lines. A fruitful area for investigation, e.g., would be the relationship of the Oxford Movement to the Evangelical Low Church Movement and how each influenced the patterns of thought of the middle class throughout this period.

GILBERT A. CAHILL

Cortland College of Education
State University of New York

Cardinal Newman As An Historian. By Thomas S. Bokenkotter. (Louvain: Editions Nauwelaerts. 1959. Pp. ix, 156. FB 150.00.)

It is a sign of his growing stature that books on Newman appear in unending succession, and that they treat him from so many points of view. Described by Pope Pius XII as "the pride of Britain and the Universal Church," he has been quoted with approval in the first encyclical of Pope John XXIII. Things have changed since the late Cardinal Moran of Sydney dismissed him in 1909 as "a bad Latinist and a poor theologian."' Father Bokenkotter's study—the most thorough that has appeared to date on this topic—is a doctoral thesis at Louvain, based on Newman's printed works, the papers at the Birmingham Oratory—among which are a number of unpublished letters to and from Acton—and a number of the standard commentaries and other secondary works. He concentrates on Newman's attitude to the use of original sources, his application of the rules of historical criticism, and the soundness of his theory on the origins of Arianism. These points are considered in detail after an introductory study of his education, the role of history in his conversion, and his historical writings as a Catholic.

Newman believed that "an Ecclesiastical History—whether long or short ought to be derived from the original sources and not compiled from the standard authorities." The splendid library he acquired—and used—for his study of the fathers shows how faithfully he practiced what he preached. Döllinger called him the greatest living authority on the first three centuries of the Christian era, and Duchesne called him the best qualified patrologist of his age. Father Bokenkotter is less favorably impressed by Newman's skill in applying the rules of historical criticism, which he thinks was often imperfect, and by the soundness of his theory on Arianism. In connection with the latter he points out that among modern writers Gwatkin disagrees with Newman entirely and Bardy agrees partially with both of them. Newman's historical style has been criticized for being too abstract and for ignoring the demands of chronology. Father Bokenkotter attributes his love of the abstract to the fact that he never wrote history for its own sake, and not to lack of the talents necessary for good historical writing. He claims Newman had "in fullest measure the sharpness of observation, depth of imagination and capaciousness of mind" needed to rival, if he so willed, even Macaulay. Moreover, his penetrating psychological insight, which was so important in his preaching and spiritual counseling, was a most valuable asset for an historian, and gives his *Historical Sketches* permanent value. His style which was strongly influenced by Gibbon, was eminently readable.

It is well known that Newman's historical writings before his conversion are better than those that came later. Father Bokenkotter offers two correct explanations for this: that after his conversion, in which it played so important a part, Newman was no longer as deeply interested in history and turned to other tasks, and that among the English Catholics neither clergy nor laity was ready for an impartial treatment of Church history. Newman's lament to a friend in 1864, when his Catholic life was almost half over: "Nothing would be better than a historical review but who could bear it? Unless one doctored all one's facts one would be thought a bad Catholic," described his position fairly. A third and most important reason not mentioned in this work was the attitude of the Roman authorities under Pius IX. The letter of Leo XIII on historical studies did not appear until 1883, when Newman's writing days were over. It served him as a vindication rather than as the encouragement and shield he needed a generation earlier.

FLORENCE D. COHALAN

Cathedral College
New York

The Life of Benedict XV. By Walter H. Peters. (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1959. Pp. viii, 321. $4.50.)

A biography of Benedict XV might well be subtitled "The Forgotten Man of the Modern Papacy." The obscurity into which he has fallen is all the more remarkable because of his personal merits and the importance of his pontificate. It is generally explained by saying that he was overshadowed by World War I and its immediate aftermath, with which his reign coincided, and by a comparison of his personality and achievements with those of Pius X and Pius XI. Granting the validity of that judgment, it remains true that Benedict deserves much more attention and gratitude than he has received. Father Peters has done us a service by recalling his memory and by giving us this account of a great servant of the Church.

It is too soon for the archives to be open—even those of Pio Nono are not available yet—so the author has had to rely on the secondary works, of very uneven merit, that have appeared since 1914, when the election of Cardinal della Chiesa to the papacy surprised the world. Father Peters' is the second biography of Benedict XV to appear in English; the first, by Father Henry E. G. Rope (*Benedict XV*. Catholic Book Club, London), which is not listed in Father Peters' bibliography, was published in 1940. There is no reason to think that the archives will disclose any secrets that can change the main outline of the story as we know it now, though, of course, they will tell us much that will be important and interesting.

Father Peters has given us a book that is more than the usual popular biography and considerably less than a scientific and professional one: there are too many undocumented assertions, too much tiresome panegyric, too many irrelevant digressions. The style itself leaves much to be desired, with its clichés, purple patches, curiously stilted idiom, and total lack of humor. The biography is, however, as the publishers claim, the most authoritative available, and so we must be grateful for it.

The surprise the outer world felt when the successor of Pius X was announced was not shown by those more familiar with the inner workings of the government of the Universal Church. One of the things that distinguishes the Vatican's diplomatic service from those of secular governments is the extraordinary continuity of policy and personnel it enjoys. This is exemplified in the career of Giacomo della Chiesa. Born in Genoa in 1854, a subject of the House of Savoy, he was the child of noble parents of moderate means. He reconciled them to his decision to take holy orders by going to Rome to study. At the Capranica and later, especially, at the Academy of Noble Ecclesiastics, in which he taught before going to Spain, he became a member of a small and select group destined for high places in the curia. They were nearly all Italians of aristocratic background—which meant a great deal before 1914—who were given a thorough training in diplomacy. Even before his ordination, della Chiesa had attracted the attention of Rampolla, himself an alumnus of the Capranica and the academy, who was to become Leo XIII's great Secretary of State and the strongest formative influence on the life of della Chiesa. Rampolla called him to the attention of Leo XIII, a shrewd judge of men, and took him to the nunciature in Madrid in 1883. The future pope's feet were now placed firmly on the ladder of preferment he was to ascend, as Cardinal Rampolla said, by taking only a few steps but big ones. Recalled to Rome with Rampolla in 1887 when the latter became Cardinal Secretary of State, he returned to the Secretariate of State and by 1901 was under-secretary, a post he retained under Pius X and Cardinal Merry del Val until his appointment to Bologna in 1907. Pastoral experience of seven years in a notoriously difficult see was crowned by the bestowal of the red hat, which he received in May, 1914, just in time to be the junior cardinal priest in the conclave from which he emerged on September 3, 1914, as Pope Benedict XV.

The career of Benedict XV is easier to describe than his personality. All who knew him agree that he was exceptionally intelligent, with a fine legal mind. His deformity—he was undersized, with one arm and leg slightly longer than the other—may have had an effect on his personality. He was shy, and took refuge in an impenetrable reserve and a rigid etiquette. Utterly devoid of the qualities that charm the crowd, and allergic to photographers and reporters, he carried to great lengths the art of self-effacement. He was frequently underestimated, and by better judges of men than Archbishop Corrigan of New York who described him "as without influence at all in theological circles." He was misunderstood by an American cardinal, who said privately, "God gave him every gift but a heart." Benedict was observant, tireless, patient, humble, and magnanimous. He was capable of strong personal loyalties, as his devotion to the replaced Rampolla shows clearly. These qualities, which enabled him to work happily in the shadows cast by brilliant personalities like Leo XIII, Rampolla, Merry del Val, Ferrata, and Gasparri, were to be very useful when he found himself, during the war, the target of vituperative attacks from all sides because he would identify himself with none of them. (His impartiality—not "neutrality"—led Clemenceau to call him German and Ludendorff to call him French.) These qualities explain the choice of the conclave which found in him the right man to steer the Church through the immense disaster of World War I.

The diplomacy of Benedict XV has been amply justified by events, and there can be very few today who would deny that the world would be immeasurably better off if his peace plan had been accepted in 1917, before the Bolshevist revolution in Russia and the downfall of the central empires, which opened the way for Stalin and Hitler. We are today less surprised than Benedict's contemporaries were to see each side in a dispute seeking to enlist the moral support of the Vatican, and we take it for granted that the Holy See will avoid involvement. The policy he laid down and pursued with unswerving fidelity was adhered to by Pius XII in World War II, and is partly responsible for the greatly enhanced international prestige of the Holy See. It is tempting to consider what Benedict would have made of "unconditional surrender" and the Nürnberg trials.

His influence on the inner life of the Church is less widely known, but it was considerable. The promulgation of the Code of Canon Law, which, with characteristic modesty, he attributed entirely to Pius X, would make his reign outstanding. Add to that the establishment of the Oriental Congregation and the Congregation for Seminaries and Universities, the Oriental Institute, the Encyclical *Maximum illud* (1919) which recalled the Church to the long-abandoned policy of erecting native hierarchies, the new and present method of selecting bishops in non-concordatory States, and we can see that a great deal was done in less than eight years.

The magnanimity and generosity of Benedict XV were shown not only in his work for the prisoners of war but also in his treatment of his opponents in the curia when he became pope. Although he disagreed with the political policies of Pius X, he was too clear sighted to miss his sanctity, and too honest not to pay tribute to it. Merry del Val, from whom Benedict differed so greatly in personality that they can hardly be considered rivals, received the Holy Office, which Pius X had given to Rampolla; the victims of Monsignor Benigni and his notorious *Sodali-*

tium Pianum were restored to favor and that unhappy experiment in espionage and delation was formally suppressed. It is strange that Father Peters, who describes the underhanded and unworthy methods the *Sodalitium Pianum* used, seems unable to decide what verdict must be passed on Benigni, whose defects appear to have been as much temperamental as moral.

There is no reason to believe that Cardinal Gasparri's great gifts were not as fully appreciated by Benedict as those of Cardinal Ferrata, whom Gasparri succeeded as Secretary of State. His retention by Pope Pius XI until he was replaced by Cardinal Pacelli in 1930 and his major role in the Code of Canon Law and in the Lateran Treaty suggest that he was more than just a good second. Father Peters might read with profit the conference given by Francesco Cardinal Roberti at the Lateran University on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the death of Cardinal Gasparri and the thirtieth anniversary of the Lateran Pact (Città del Vaticano, 1959). Benedict was a good judge of men—except in the case of Von Gerlach. (Father Peters' account of the unfortunate Von Gerlach incident is, perhaps, the best thing in the book.) Benedict had much to do with the careers of his three immediate successors, for he sent Ratti to Warsaw and Milan, Pacelli to Munich, and Roncalli to the office of national director of the S.P.F. in Rome, which was to launch him on his career.

Father Peters' book would profit much by a careful rewriting that would tighten up the sentence structure and eliminate some jejune comments and superfluous moralizing. Just a few random examples. "It was a matter of general amusement that Leo XIII invariably referred to Rampolla as *il Cardinale* as though there were but one genuine cardinal and the other members of the apostolic college had the title only in a broad sense" (p. 28). This is surely a rather naive conclusion. In Baltimore, Gibbons is still referred to as "the Cardinal" and the same is true of Newman at the Edgbaston Oratory. Pius X often referred to Rampolla as *il Cardinalone*. Father Peters writes: "He (Benedict) knew just what to do, though with his usual delicacy he waited courteously for the nod from the master of ceremonies" (p. 88). Does not one always wait for the nod? Benedict simply knew his ceremonies. Again: "Latin literature was his hobby and curial style the subject he taught in the Academy of Noble Ecclesiastics" (p. 257). From this the author seems to conclude that Benedict wrote the Latin of his encyclicals. By the same reasoning we might conclude that Leo XIII, an even greater Latinist, wrote, e.g., the Latin of *Rerum novarum;* but we know that it was written by his Latin secretary, Monsignor Volpini (cf. *L'Enciclica Rerum novarum,* a cura di Mons. Giovanni Antonazzi, [Roma, 1957]). Contrary to the author's implication, all nuncios receive the archiepiscopal dignity; it was not a special favor granted to Pacelli "to lend prestige to the young Nuncio" (p. 141). "A pang of anguish shot through his innermost parts" (p. 268) sounds like a literal and excessively visceral translation. "Did he remember the accusation of himself to his predecessor that he is said to have found unopened on the desk of Saint Pius X when he came to take the helm of Peter's boat?" (p. 273) might have been written a bit more clearly. Writing of the deathbed moments of Benedict, Father Peters observes: "While arrangements were being made, he begged for absolute solitude so that he could prepare for that which for the Supreme Pontiff as well as for the simplest heir of heaven is a very important step in his mortal life" (p. 270). A very important step, indeed. The incident of the old tailor and the three cassocks (p. 81) has no humor left when Father Peters gets through with it. And surely Benedict should have been allowed to "take a box of biscuits with him to feed the birds" in the Vatican gardens without having Father Peters (or, rather, even worse, the birds) recognize in him a "modern version of Saint Francis" (p. 98).

In a future revision, finally, the following corrections and remarks might be taken into account: p. 12, for "Mazella" read "Mazzella"; p. 40: I have never seen *devictissimus* (from *devincere*) used in the meaning of "loyal," "obedient," "greatly devoted to"—I suspect Pope Pius wrote *devinctissimus* (from *devincire*), which is a common expression; p. 76, "conclave" is a Latin word taken over into Italian; p. 91, for "frought" read "fraught"; p. 121, for "estesso" read "esteso"; p. 268, for "think" read "thought"; p. 268, for "some object of piety" read "some religious article"; p. 268, for "Vanutelli" read "Vannutelli"; p. 272, for "offriemo" read "offriamo"; p. 267, for "ode 2: 19" read "ode 20: 19"; p. 282, for "Quattre" read "Quattro"; pp. 294, 306, for "Battifol" read "Batiffol"; p. 302, for "Gwyn" read "Gwynn"; and, p. 304, why is the German translation of the O'Reilly book given in the bibliography?

JOSEPH P. CHRISTOPHER

Seton Hall University

The Russian Revolution and Religion. A Collection of Documents concerning the Suppression of Religion by the Communists, 1917-1925. With an introductory essay, appendices and a selective bibliography. Translated and edited by Boleslaw Szczesniak. (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press. 1959. Pp. xx, 289. $6.75.)

The title of this book might mislead some readers to expect complete documentation on religious groups in Russia during this period from 1917 to 1925. This is not the case. A few of the documents are concerned with the general problems of religion in Russia, but most of them refer specifically to the Russian Orthodox Church or to the Roman Catholic Church.

The emphasis on the Russian Orthodox Church is, of course, justifiable in terms of the predominance of that religious affiliation in Russia. However, the Protestant sects certainly merit as much coverage as the Roman Catholic Church in any study of "religion in Russia." This is especially true since the author himself states: "The title of this book indicates that all religions of the Russian empire are considered for documentation of their fate during the Revolution of 1917-1925" (p. vii). The author claims that this special emphasis on the Roman Catholic Church is "necessary" —though he never clarifies the reasons for this proposed necessity. In any case, he should have "necessarily" changed the title of his book, in order to indicate this particular approach to the subject, since not only the Protestant sects, but also the Jewish and Moslem faiths, as well as Buddhism, Shamanism, and other religious cults deserve more documentation than is to be found in this book.

The text of the documents consists mostly of translations of Soviet laws, articles from Russian newspapers, and selections from the papers of the late Edmund Walsh, S.J., former papal representative to Russia. The appendices contain abundant materials on other Soviet legislation concerning religious groups, biographical data on some Orthodox and Roman Catholic prelates, and statistics on the Roman Catholic Church in Russia. The bibliography is very extensive, although the author curiously omits Matthew Spinka's book, *The Church in Soviet Russia.*

In a short introductory essay Professor Szczesniak emphasizes the factor of Russian Orthodoxy's lack of "any central organization of purpose" to explain the "downfall" of that church in Russia and abroad. A lack of strict, structural organization cannot be considered *per se* as the reason for its "downfall." Certainly one cannot ignore the importance of the role which individual Russian church leaders played or failed to play during the period from 1917 to 1925. After all, the strength of any religious group is often something more and less than the organization of its officialdom, however tight or loose this may be. This is particularly true in Russia where religion resides more in individual people, rather than in formal church organization.

Professor Szczesniak's book does provide the English-reading public with some highly important texts on some of the interesting, official Soviet measures against religion, in general, and the Russian Orthodox and Roman Catholic Churches, in detail. In order to avoid any danger of distorting the real import of the Soviet position on the Orthodox Church, each reader should be somewhat conversant with the historical position of the Russian Church in tsarist times. Robert P. Casey has a valuable chapter devoted to the pre-revolutionary aspects of the Russian Church in his slender volume, *Religion in Russia*. J. S. Curtiss' book on *The Russian Church and the Soviet State, 1917-1950,* Matthew Spinka's numerous works on the subject, as well as those of Nicholas Timasheff and Paul Anderson, have not lost their value, nor has Alexander Kischkowsky's monograph, *Die sowjetische Religionspolitik und die russische orthodoxe Kirche*.

The documentation in this book concentrates heavily upon the legal measures taken to crush the influence of prelates in Russia. The perspicacious reader should note that these measures not only reflect Soviet anticlericalism, but also the continued importance of religion in the life of the Russian people. As the Minister of Education, Lunacharsky, admitted in 1928, when he was leading a frontal attack on religion, "Religion is like a nail; the harder you hit it, the deeper it goes into the wood."

RAYMOND T. MCNALLY

Boston College

Christianity in Conflict. A Catholic View of Protestantism. By John A. Hardon, S.J. (Westminster: Newman Press. 1959. Pp. xiii, 300. $4.50.)

It will be no news to Catholic readers that there are a number of different kinds of Protestants. The fact that the reviewer is still, despite the scorn that has been heaped upon the liberal in recent years, a slightly chastened, perhaps, but essentially unreconstructed liberal, is the final determining factor in most of what he will have to say. First of all, Father Hardon's work is exceedingly well done within the framework of his own point of view. It shows a profound acquaintance with most aspects of Protestantism. But he seems to me somehow to miss its spirit, and that, perhaps, is the one thing that really links Protestantism into some kind of a unity.

Perhaps it was right to single out the principle of subjectivity as the chief feature of Protestantism. Basically, that is about it, the ultimate willingness to stand on the principle of some kind of an inner witness as to his relationship to God, and to depend on that rather than upon some external authority. True, Protestants recognize the authority of the Bible, as the author affirms. But there is always the assertion of the ultimate right, and the ability, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, to interpret what the sacred text means. Perhaps, Protestants prefer the authority of the Bible to that of the Church just because their trust is greater in a book which has proved itself, and which remains constant, than in an on-going institution, dependent, as they see it, upon fallible human leadership.

I suppose that what Protestants cherish most is freedom. While there is among Protestants a wholesome dislike for the vast proliferation of denominations and sects, many of which do little credit to the Christian faith, if they were confronted with the alternative of accepting this, with all the possibilities of abuse which it affords, or submission to an institution which denies this freedom, the vast majority would not hesitate as to their choice. For Protestants understand the Roman Catholic Church to say that it does have the truth, and that freedom for the individual ends when the Church has spoken officially on dogmatic matters. At that point the Protestant protests, whether he be a Unitarian, a Methodist, an Anglican, a Holy-Roller, or a Mennonite.

The author has ably and skillfully anticipated—not always convincingly, perhaps—the Protestant criticisms of Roman Catholic beliefs and practices, and has well pointed out some of the values which he thinks are carried over into Protestantism from what he calls the Catholic Church. In this he is quite correct. The Protestant Churches affirm in every repetition of the Apostles Creed their belief in the Holy Catholic Church, i.e., the Universal Christian Church from which the Roman Catholic Church has also taken so much, but to which the Protestants generally think it has also added a great deal. In other words, they insist that the attempt of the Protestant Church has been to recover the basic elements of the Universal Church, while leaving aside what they regard as innovations, or in some cases, corruptions, of the beliefs and/or practices of the original Universal Church. Among these they would place prominently the progressive elevation of the Virgin to the high place upon which they today place her; the doctrine of purgatory, with the power of the keys, which gives the Church a measure of control over the souls of men beyond the grave, through indulgences granted to the living and Masses for the dead, after their departure; and, finally, to mention only two others, the assertion of the infallibility of the pope when speaking *ex cathedra,* and the belief that the Roman Catholic Church is the one and only *true* Church. Generally speaking, Protestants do not for these reasons believe that the Roman Catholic Church is not a true church, or a vehicle of salvation, but that it is only one of many forms which Christianity has assumed in the course of history; and it is their fond hope that the Church of Rome will one day recognize this.

The reviewer welcomes such books as this of Father Hardon from representatives of the Roman Catholic Church. The excellent spirit in which it is written commends it to Protestant readers, of whom it is to be hoped that the author will have many. The straightforward statement of firmly held convictions is a good thing, I think, from both sides. Honest differences of opinion are always possible among friends, and that, I am convinced, all Christians of whatever stripe ought certainly to be.

CHARLES S. BRADEN

Northwestern University

The Church and the Nations. A Study of Minority Catholicism in England, India, Norway, America, Lebanon, Australia, Wales, Japan, the Netherlands, Vietnam, Brazil, Egypt, Southern Africa, and among the Lele of the Congo. Edited by Adrian Hastings. (New York: Sheed & Ward. 1959. Pp. xxii, 238. $4.75.)

There are several interesting as well as instructive essays in this volume. The number of countries included in this symposium, and the fact that the writers are generally living within the countries studied, gives to each essay its own importance and at the same time a definite limitation. As the introduction points out, the existence of a Catholic minority against the background of a non-Catholic majority culture necessarily raises the question of the relationship between religion and culture. It is probably true that there is no culture without a religious element. In that sense even the Soviets' atheism partakes of a kind of religious devotion to the destruction of belief in God. But there is one element that distinguishes Catholicism from nearly every other religious form and that is the fact that its doctrine and practices are determined authoritatively and at least implicitly in its supernatural mission. This supernatural mission does have effects in the culture in which it is active, but there seems to be no culture that is an essential part of the Catholic Christian life.

In nearly every country where Catholicism is a minority it is in conflict with a religion and with a culture that denies the Catholic idea of a unique mission. Of course, where there is a nationality, a member of that nationality tends to believe that his nation has a superior culture—at least better for that region or circumstance. Thus it is important to realize that while each nation has a right to its cultural tradition, the conflict between Catholicism and the majority culture is not in the culture but in religion itself. Some of these accounts must be accepted as eyewitness reports with the importance as well as the narrowness that this fact implies. The tone of most of the essays is not very optimistic. Most of the writers seem to desire Catholic cultural leadership. Bad cultural leadership has existed among Catholic groups in non-Catholic countries even to the point of giving scandal. But there is no definite proof that Catholic intellectual leadership is effective in promoting the work of the

Church. The statement of John Lynch that the English converts have brought intellectuality and the Irish immigrants the numbers in England, fails to talk about the sterility of a third group. Philip Scharper's statement that the Catholic press is an accurate reflection of the American Catholic mind could hardly come from reading that press. The account about Australia seems to justify the Catholic minority's theory of the "secularity" of the state without seeing that it is a confession of defeat. The account of Catholicism in Wales is startling, but it is a good account of the effect of confusing religion and culture. All in all, this is a commendable effort to promote that world-wide charity and understanding which is badly needed in the English-speaking Catholic world. Until Catholics can support larger and more detailed studies, this type should be multiplied.

THOMAS T. MCAVOY

University of Notre Dame

AMERICAN CHURCH

Their Rights and Liberties. The Beginnings of Religious and Political Freedom in Maryland. By Thomas O. Hanley, S.J. (Westminster: Newman Press. 1959. Pp. xv, 142. $2.75.)

The subject of Church-State relations with which this book largely deals is of perennial interest, but is seldom more timely than at the present moment. The author, fully conscious of its relevance, has invited one of the most articulate of contemporary American Catholic political figures, Eugene J. McCarthy, United States Senator from Minnesota, to write a foreword to the volume. Incisively, Senator McCarthy outlines the author's theme and, reflecting thereon, urges the reader to recognize the necessity for "prudential judgment and adjustment" on Church-State matters in the face of the new circumstances of twentieth-century America, even as the transplanted English Catholics of the seventeenth century reversed in the new world "the prevailing European doctrines and policies regarding the state and its relationship to religion and individual conscience." Only "on the basis of personal freedom in the spirit of the Ninth Amendment," he maintains, can the disputed areas between Church and State be worked out in a democratic society.

The book itself sets the Maryland essay in self-government and toleration into the framework of English Catholic minority views propounded earlier by St. Thomas More and Cardinal Allen, both of whom were true to the thinking of Pope Gelasius, who, in the fifth century, carefully distinguished between the obedience due to the separate sovereignties and distinct functions of the spiritual and temporal powers. It may, however, be argued that the author has given too much space, in so short a book, to the English background and has insufficiently explored the American scene. As it stands, a more appropriate title would be: "The Dissident Minority Opinion of English Catholics on Church and State with Some Reference to Maryland." In view of this theme, Chapter Six, "Those Professing Belief," is particularly open to the charge of superficiality, which the author excuses on the ground that he is simply trying to indicate the persistence of a tradition.

It may, secondly, be argued that, in view of the paucity of explicit evidence, the author has made too many large assumptions concerning the influence of this English Catholic background in the elaboration of Maryland's policy of toleration. He contends that the pivotal document here is the Ordinance of 1639, which, affirming with More and Allen (and to some degree, Bellarmine) the "autonomous nature of church and state," became the "underpinning" of Maryland's tradition of toleration. This may well be, but the circumstances surrounding the evolution of this ordinance and the thinking which motivated it are not so clear that this can be asserted with certainty. The ***Proceedings and Acts of the Assembly,*** in conjunction with contemporary reports, indicate, indeed, that it was the product of a tussle between the proprietor and the assembly. However, the reader of these documents is left with only one conviction: the assembly refused, in any phase of the temporal or spiritual order, to submit to being mere subjects of an absolute lord. As the author of this book clearly shows, they insisted on "all their rights and liberties according to the Great Charter." In this, they were true seventeenth-century Englishmen.

But, how, specifically, did the ordinance affirm the "autonomous nature of church and state"? The author's conclusion in this regard rests, generally, on the process of logical deduction, and, immediately, on the rather tenuous argument of the assembly's having eliminated from the ordinance the word "immunities," thereby, as he says, cutting off the Maryland Church from the stream of continental theory and practice. It seems impossible to show, on the basis of explicit historical records, that the insurgent assemblymen, under the leadership of Captain Thomas Cornwaleys, were inspired by their "broad general understanding of the growing Catholic tradition in England." Until we know much more about the English recusant mentality of the early Stuart period and acquire better knowledge of the character, backgrounds, and thinking of the individuals who made up the membership of the colonial Maryland assemblies, we are only going to be able to suggest, as does the author of this thought-provoking volume, that "we may have today a distinctive tradition among Catholics, the outcome of their American experience which began in the precedents of the 1639 ordinance." We may be encouraged to a further exploration of this theme by recalling the words written by Charles M. Andrews a quarter of a century ago: "But the significant fact remains that in no other colony of the period was the experiment even tried of Roman Catholics and Protestants living side by side on terms of equality, amity, and forbearance. In that respect the settlement of Maryland holds a unique place in the history of English colonization."

SISTER JOAN DE LOURDES LEONARD

St. Joseph's College for Women
Brooklyn

NOTES AND COMMENTS

An American Committee on Irish Studies has been organized to establish communication between all those interested in Irish history and literature. The following officers have been selected: president, Gilbert Cahill, State University of New York (Cortland); vice-president, Thomas N. Brown, Portsmouth Priory; treasurer, Emmet Larkin, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; secretary, Lawrence J. McCaffrey, University of Illinois. At present the committee is co-operating with the National Library of Ireland in a project to microfilm the materials on Britain and Ireland in the Propaganda archives in Rome. The American Council of Learned Societies and the Newberry Library, Chicago, are helping to finance the project, and a copy of the film will be deposited at the Newberry Library. The committee is also preparing a collection of essays on Ireland, 1800-1922. All those interested in joining the Committee are requested to contact Lawrence J. McCaffrey, assistant professor of history, Division of General Studies, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.

On July 4 the 1,600 Sisters of the Holy Family of Nazareth in the United States celebrated the seventy-fifth anniversary of their community's arrival from Rome. Headed by their foundress, Mother Frances Siedliska, the first eleven sisters destined for the American mission landed in New York in 1885. They opened their first American house in Chicago. The venerable foundress herself also established several subsequent missions in the Middle West and along the East Coast before her death in 1902. The congregation, which was founded in Rome in 1875, was approved as a pontifical institute in 1909. The present mother general is the first American to head the community; Mother Mary Neomisia, a native of Philadelphia, has held this position since June, 1959. The American Sisters of the Holy Family of Nazareth now have 111 convents in nine archdioceses and twenty-three dioceses; they are engaged in the triple apostolate of teaching on all levels, nursing, and social work. American members of the congregation have also made foundations in Australia and Puerto Rico.

On July 21 the Capuchin Fathers of Mount Calvary, Wisconsin, observed the centennial of the founding of St. Lawrence Minor Seminary. Archbishop Egidio Vagnozzi, Apostolic Delegate to the United States, offered the festive Mass, and Archbishop William E. Cousins of Milwaukee delivered the centennial address. When this pioneer school opened its doors in 1860, there were four students enrolled. Since that date, some 2,000 priests in the Midwest have made their preparatory studies there.

An institute dealing with Polish culture was held at the University of Minnesota's Center for Continuation Study, Minneapolis, August 3-5. The theme for the conference was "Poland through a Thousand Years." Two American Catholic scholars of Polish history participated. Father Ladislaus J. Siekaniec, O.F.M., of Our Lady of Angels Seminary, Cleveland, and past president of the Polish-American Historical Association, spoke on "The Importance of Preserving the History of Immigration," and Professor M. K. Dziewanowski, of the Department of History at Boston College and recently appointed an associate of the Russian Research Center at Harvard University, discussed Poland's history, culture and political significance.

The Holy See was represented at the eleventh International Congress of Historical Sciences held in Stockholm, August 21-28, by about fifteen delegates. The Most Reverend Ansgar Nelson, O.S.B., Bishop of Stockholm, was host at a reception to the forty some priests who were attending the congress. This event in itself was somewhat historic, for it probably drew together the largest number of Catholic clergy gathered in Sweden since the Reformation.

The fiftieth anniversary of Catholic mission science will be observed at *Das Internationale Institut für missionswissenschaftliche Forschungen* in Münster next year, probably toward the end of June. The celebration will mark the founding in 1911 of the first professorship of Catholic missiology in the University of Münster. Josef Schmidlin, S.V.D., gave the first courses in mission theory and history. He also inaugurated the *Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft* the same year. The international conference will be organized in two parts; a study week will first be devoted to mission theory and science, and then all the pontifical societies engaged in the direction of Catholic missions will hold meetings for a week to discuss problems of a practical nature. Joseph Glazik, M.S.C., professor of missiology in the University of Würzburg, is the chairman of the organizing committee.

A new periodical called the *Bollettino dell'Istituto di Storia della Società e dello Stato Veneziano* has appeared in its first issue (1959). In this annual are to be presented the shorter monographs produced under the auspices of the institute for the history of the *Serenissima Repubblica*. Volume I contains such articles as "La société vénitienne et la Reforme protestante au XVI^{e} siècle," by Edouard Pommier; "Paolo Sarpi tra il cattolico Philippe Canaye de Fresnes e il calvinista Isaac Casaubon," by Gaetano Cozzi; and "Archbishop Blackader [of Glasgow] in Venice [en route to the Holy Land in 1508]," by Rosamund J. Mitchell. There are also briefer studies and book reviews. The bulletin is published by the Fondazione Giorgio Cini, Centro di Cultura e Civiltà, on the island of San Giorgio Maggiore.

The indices to the Archives of the Archbishop of Westminster, "A" Series, Volumes I-IL (1501-1793), are now available on microfilm. The "A" Series of the Westminster Cathedral Archives are mainly official papers concerned with the administration of the Church during penal times; they also contain private papers and such government papers as the orders in council of the reign of Elizabeth I. Each of these forty-nine volumes has its own index; the volumes from 1501 to 1688 were indexed during Cardinal Manning's episcopate, and those from 1688 to 1793 during Cardinal Bourne's. Inquiries regarding purchase should be addressed to Micro Methods Limited, East Ardsley, Wakefield, Yorks.

While the Catholic history of California's mission era is well known, the same cannot be said for the role played by the Church in California in the nineteenth century. Recent numbers of two California publications have contained worthwhile items in that connection. The June, 1959, issue of the *California Historical Society Quarterly* (San Francisco) carried a brief memoir by Nasario Galindo which dealt with the Santa Clara Mission in the last years before the secularization of the 1830's. Galindo was the son of the *majordomo del campo* of Santa Clara and was in his twenties at the time of the events he described. In the same number there is a description of the California Indians as seen by a Belgian-born physician, Jean Joseph François Haine, who took his medical training at the Catholic University of Louvain and who arrived in San Francisco in January, 1850, and remained until the early 1880's. The March, 1960, issue of the *Historical Society of Southern California Quarterly* (Los Angeles) has the first installment of an article by J. Thomas Owen entitled "The Church by the Plaza," which gives a detailed account of the old plaza church in downtown Los Angeles. It was completed in 1822 and for many years served the area as the principal Catholic place of worship. The Historical Society of Southern California, founded in 1884, is the oldest in the West. Its current issue of September carries a feature story on Father Maynard Geiger, O.F.M., of Santa Barbara Mission, the author of the recent two-volume biography of Junípero Serra.

Wisconsin is the latest state to be studied by Eugene P. Willging and Herta Hatzfeld in their *Catholic Serials of the Nineteenth Century in the United States.* As Part II of the Second Series, this volume of the descriptive bibliography and union list has recently been published by the Catholic University of America Press. It includes a historical introduction, an alphabetical list of the serials with all pertinent data, an analysis of frequency, type, Catholicity, language and nationality, a chronological table, a list of "firsts," and then the main body of the book in which each serial is described under the place of publication. A general bibliography and an index fill out the 125 pages of this useful tool.

The Historical Institute of the Capuchins in Rome has recently brought out Volume XI of its *Bibliographia Franciscana.* This is a section of the *Collectanea Franciscana* which contains the titles of the principal works relating to Franciscan history that were published between 1954 and 1957. After each of the 542 entries a paragraph in Latin sets forth the nature and value of the particular work. The titles are arranged by categories, and there is an index of authors.

Bibliografia Missionaria for 1959 has been published by the Pontifical Missionary Library of the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide in Rome. Compiled by three Oblates of Mary Immaculate, Fathers John Rommerskirchen, Nicholas Kowalsky, and Joseph Metzler, this bibliography lists 1,211 titles that appeared last year. After the general sections the main divisions are geographical; an appendix contains brief reviews of forty-seven books sent to the Missionary Library. Although many of these writings deal with current problems, others are purely historical in nature.

Until 1938 *The Rule of the Master* had been generally considered as a commentary on the *Rule of St. Benedict.* In that year, however, Dom Augustine Génestout of Solesmes Abbey proposed that *The Rule of the Master* was of a much earlier derivation. If this theory were verified, it would appear that St. Benedict drew the major principles of his great pattern of spirituality from the anonymous *Rule.* A lively controversy resulted among Benedictine scholars in which the *Rule* was submitted to paleographical and every other scientific scrutiny. During the following years the patience of these scholars has illumined the path to a solution which is not, however, quite in sight. Dom Odo Zimmermann has performed a fine service by collecting all the books and articles relating to the debate and editing them in a chronological, descriptive bibliography. This appears under the title, "An Unsolved Problem: The Rule of Saint Benedict and the Rule of the Master," *The American Benedictine Review,* X (March-June, 1959), 86-106.

The significance of the Collection *Anselmo dedicata* in the history of canon law is well known to mediaevalists. Having its origins somewhere in the ninth century, it presents a series of texts and arguments favorable to the Bishop of Rome. In it are fragments from the letters of Gregory I, the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, the Dionysio-Hadrian collection, etc. The first book, treating the Roman See and its primacy over patriarchs, primates, and metropolitans, has been edited by Jean-Claude Besse together with a critical indication of the sources of each passage. The document has particular relevance as a summary of mediaeval thought on Roman primacy with regard to the modern study of ecumenicalism (*Revue de droit canonique,* IX [September, 1959], 207-296). Of similar interest is the textual criticism of the *Apparatus ad Decretum* of Alanus Anglicus performed by Alfons M. Stickler, "Alanus Anglicus als Verteidiger des monarchischen Papsttums," *Salesianum,* XXI (April-September, 1959), 346-406.

Monsignor L. Cristiani, doyen honoraire de l'Université Catholique de Lyon, continues his analysis of religious tolerance and intolerance in the current issue of the *Journal of World History* (Volume V-4, 1960). He specifically examines and evaluates the attitudes prevalent during the sixteenth century.

A *mélange* of the numerous writings of Rudolph Guilland appears in *Byzantion,* XXVIII, (1958), vi-xiii. Guilland is being honored as the collaborator and continuator of the late Charles Diehl, and in this summary he appears as an outstanding authority with regard to the palace administration and typography of Constantinople.

Philip Hughes hopes to have ready within a year "The Catholic Reformation, 1560-1610," a work which he has contracted to write as Volume IV of the Rise of Modern Europe Series, published by Harper & Brothers. Meanwhile, thanks to his improved health, he has been able to finish a book on the ecumenical councils which will appear by the end of this year. Monsignor Hughes is also planning to complete his general history of the Church in five volumes. In Volume IV he will treat the period from 1517 to 1648; in the final volume he will carry the account up to the French Revolution.

Eugene Willging, Director of Libraries in the Catholic University of America, has compiled a complete list of all Catholic books that are now available in paperback form. There are in print over 800 such titles published by more than ninety different companies. Mr. Willging's list is being published by the Catholic Book Merchandiser under the title "Catalog of Catholic Paperback Books." Listing is by author, title, and subject matter, and the prices are given. Teachers of history will be interested in the wide variety of titles offered in their field.

Charles W. Arnade, Latin Americanist of the Department of History in the University of Florida, will be a visiting associate professor during the academic year 1960-1961 at the State University of Iowa, taking the place of Charles Gibson.

Georges Bonnin has been elected research fellow at St. Anthony's College, Oxford, for two years. Dr. Bonnin has been teaching the history of Russia and the foreign policy of the Soviet Union in the Overseas Program of the University of Maryland.

At the Institute of American History held at Stanford University during June, one of the principal guest speakers was Robert F. Byrnes, chairman of the Department of History in Indiana University and first vice president of the American Catholic Historical Association. Professor Byrnes spoke on the organization of a general freshman course in European history.

Francis Dvornik of the Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection of Harvard University was awarded the Haskins Medal of the Mediaeval Academy of America at the thirty-fifth annual meeting held at Radcliffe College on April 30. Father Dvornik's latest honor was bestowed for his book, *The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew.*

David Herlihy of Bryn Mawr College, an advisory editor of the REVIEW, has received the Everett Eugene Edwards Award for 1959. This prize is given by the Agricultural History Society for the best article by an advanced scholar published each year in the society's journal, *Agricultural History.*

At Marquette University, Eugene H. Korth, S.J., former director of the Department of History, has been named dean of the College of Liberal Arts. Direction of the department has been assumed by a committee composed of Joseph P. Donnelly, S.J., as chairman and William D. Miller and Herbert W. Rice. Francis Paul Prucha, S. J., joined the department this fall to teach American history.

Robert E. Lamb, C.S.B., of the University of St. Thomas, Houston, will take a sabbatical leave during the academic year 1960-1961 in order to use a research grant that he has received from the Italian government. Father Lamb plans to work in the early nineteenth-century history of the Papal States.

Sister M. Justille McDonald, F.S.P.A., was named president of Viterbo College in LaCrosse, Wisconsin, at the beginning of the present academic year. Sister Justille took her doctorate in 1954 at the Catholic University of America with a dissertation entitled *History of the Irish in Wisconsin in the Nineteenth Century*.

Raymond T. McNally of Boston College will go to Leningrad in February in order to do research on the Russian philosopher of history, Peter Chaadayev. Dr. McNally has been selected by the Inter-University Committee on Travel Grants as one of the American participants in the cultural exchange agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union. He has also been accepted by the Soviet authorities, and he expects to be granted access to the Russian archives of the Academy of Science in Leningrad. He will spend over five months in Russia.

The editors of the REVIEW take this opportunity to extend their sincere congratulations to John J. Meng, president of the Association in 1945, upon his inauguration on October 31 as president of Hunter College.

William O. Shanahan, who, with the exception of his years of service with the United States Navy during World War II, has taught at the University of Notre Dame since 1941, assumed at the opening of the present semester his new duties as chairman of the Department of History at the University of Oregon. Professor Shanahan is at present a member of the Executive Council of the Association.

* * * * *

"I regret that in my review of Mr. B. B. Barber's *The McLoughlin Empire and its Rulers,* published in these pages last April (XLVI, 71-72), I wrongly stated that the author claimed to publish a large block of McLoughlin letters for the first time. Mr. Barber actually wrote: 'The majority of seventy letters is published here for the first time' (p. 21). I hereby acknowledge my mistake and offer my apology to the author.

W. L. DAVIS"

BRIEF NOTICES

Dorcy, Sister Mary Jean, O.P. *Saint Dominic.* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co. 1959. Pp. xi, 173. $3.25.)

There are, unfortunately, few grounds, if any, on which Sister Mary Jean Dorcy's anecdotal biography of St. Dominic may be commended to the serious historian. The book is obviously intended for devotional, not scholarly, uses and it lacks any claims to serious consideration as a critical treatment of its subject. The author has evidently drawn upon her sources primarily in order to present the picturesque anecdote, the legendary circumstance, or the marvellous occurrence which may possibly stimulate her reader's pious devotion, even though, at the same time, it may grievously offend the canons of evidence. Legends and stories, frequently of the most questionable authenticity, are used freely as basic sources of factual information. Where facts are in dispute, no attempt is made to deal adequately with conflicting evidence and divergent theories. E.g., see the discussion concerning N.-D. de Prouille (pp. 19-21). The Cathari are dismissed with a few pejorative phrases ("corruption of faith," "frightful immorality," "spirit of revolution and sedition" (all at p. 17), without any real attempt to try to show what the whole movement was about or why it had such tremendous appeal as it did. Thus, again, when the devotion of the rosary and its relationship to St. Dominic is discussed, the testimony of Alan de la Roche is adduced as decisive and we are told, in support of Alan's statements, that at least Alan has been proposed for canonization, "which is more than can be said for most of his enemies" (i.e., those who doubt the authenticity of the legends Alan records).

A dust-jacket blurb proclaims that this is the first volume of the publisher's Cross and Crown series to have been written by an American author. It is a poor advertisement for American Catholic scholarship. (James A. Brundage)

Grossi, Roberto. *Castrum Campus Silvae Historia.* (Città del Vaticano: Tipografia Poliglotta Vaticana. 1956. Pp. xi, 368. $20.00.)

This work is a history of the fief and castle of Camporsevoli located southeast of Chiusi in central Italy. It is a scholarly book, but it represents a labor of love, as Camporsevoli is the ancestral home of the Marchese di Grossi. Part I deals with the history proper of the fief and its many vicissitudes from the Lombard period to the nineteenth century; Part II, with the organization and the juridical life of the fief; Part III, with the religious, social, and economic life of the castle in mediaeval and modern times; Part IV comprises a conclusion and a long appendix containing a number of pertinent original sources. The author has given a comprehensive and detailed account of an Italian fief and castle. A thousand years of its history have been made possible by the considerable body of extant documentation—the more important documents being reproduced in facsimile or in printed form. Parts II and III are especially vivid and informing. Readers already familiar with Miss Catherine Boyd's *Tithes and Parishes in Medieval Italy* (Ithaca, 1952) will find this work of particular interest and value. The book is a quarto beautifully printed and bound. It is furnished with forty-eight plates, tables, and figures, including several illustrations in color as well as a bibliography and an index. (MARTIN R. P. MCGUIRE)

HAMILTON, ELIZABETH. *Saint Teresa. A Journey to Spain.* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1959. Pp. 192. $3.50.)

Like Marcelle Auclair, the French biographer of St. Teresa, Elizabeth Hamilton received permission to visit the enclosures of the two convents in Avila, the Incarnation and St. Joseph's. Using this privilege with her knowledge of St. Teresa's writings and the kind of an imagination a good biographer needs, Miss Hamilton has written with veneration, enthusiasm, and objectivity.

Half of the book describes the life of Teresa from birth in 1515 to the founding of the first reformed convent, St. Joseph's, in 1562. These were her least important years, but they must be known in order to appreciate her great years. Good birth, family affection, and beauty, one of the nuns often asked for at the Incarnation—who would expect such a nun at forty-seven to begin founding convents under the stricter rule and to show the will power needed in traveling under hardships and in meeting opposition from both civil and religious authorities? The second half of the book describes St. Teresa's foundations and the cities as they were seen by a twentieth-century traveler. Some of the photographs and the map of Spain help any reader or an arm-chair traveler to relive Teresa's days: she saw the walls of Avila many times, she visited St. Thomas' convent, she knew about women going to the river to wash their clothes and swineherds driving their pigs to market.

The shortness of the biography does not lessen its value. It would seem flawless with a little more editing. Such details, as the one about an owl (p. 17), break the continuity. Many Spanish phrases are unnecessary when the English translations are given. (MARY LUCILLE SHAY)

HOGAN, JAMES and MCNEILL O'FARRELL, N. (Eds.). *The Walsingham Letter-Book or Register of Ireland—May, 1578 to December, 1579.* (Dublin: Stationary Office, for the Irish Manuscripts Commission. 1959. Pp. xix, 279. 2 guineas.)

The failure of the expeditions of James Fitzmaurice and Thomas Stukely against Elizabethan rule in Ireland was so complete as to cause us to forget how real were the apprehensions in English government circles at the time. The expeditions constituted the first papal-inspired assault on the Elizabethan rule in Ireland, and as such unified, or bade fair to unify, Catholic Anglo-Irish and Celts in a common resistance to the Protestant ruler. Small wonder it was that Secretary Walsingham's English and Irish officials deluded even themselves with propaganda suggesting a St. Bartholemew massacre in Ireland in the event of successes for the papal troops.

The documents here presented offer a fine picture of the governmental position in those critical years. We are shown the efforts to consolidate a most uncertain Irish situation, and the attempts to retain the loyalty of the Irish aristocracy. There is even a captured letter to Fitzmaurice from one of his associates, greatly enhancing the volume's worth. Professor Hogan and his associates have admirably edited and indexed the material, with a concise introduction free from controversial comment (a pleasant contrast to certain other volumes in this series). It is to be hoped that the sense of Ireland's significance in Counter-Reformation Europe, which this work gives us, will be increased in the near future by the publication of Dr. Hogan's long-overdue second volume of his *Ireland in the European System.*

The publication of *The Walsingham Letter-Book* should prove a matter of permanent benefit to historians of England, Ireland, and Europe in this period. Unfortunately, the permanence must remain a question of hope rather than expectation, in view of the poor quality of the paper on which the book is printed—and well printed. A slight additional expenditure would prevent the publications of the Irish Manuscripts Commission from ultimately sinking to the condition of unbindable brittleness that now characterizes the calendars of state papers which the present work so excellently supplements. (OWEN DUDLEY EDWARDS)

JACKSON, J. HAMPTON (Ed.). *A Short History of France to the Present Day.* (New York: Cambridge University Press. 1959. Pp. ix, 221. $3.95.)

The statement on the jacket of this book reads that its contents are "based on the historical sections of the Handbook first issued by the Naval Intelligence Division of the Admiralty during the war [World War II]." Contributors number Sir Ernest Barker, D. W. Brogan, Herbert Butterfield, H. C. Darby, A. Ewert, and I. L. Foster, while Mr. Jackson has edited the volume and written several of its sections. The contents run from the earliest times to the era of recovery after World War II.

Mr. Jackson in his usual competent way has done a splendid bit of editing. Such a small volume, which attempts to cover all of French history, is necessarily highly selective. Historians can be quite critical of a volume of this nature. It would be difficult to obtain a meeting of minds on content. This reviewer believes that the subject matter is both wisely selective and beautifully written. There are few handbooks of this sort that are so clear and concise. The highlights, main movements, and critical periods in French history are carefully selected and critically treated. Students beginning a study of French history will find here a fine introduction to the subject, and when they read the last sentence they will not only be possessed of a good elementary knowledge of French history, but will also be inspired to read in greater depth.

One of the highlights of the book are the thirty-five maps and diagrams. At first sight the reviewer developed an almost immediate negative reaction to the volume. With the market flooded with "digest" material, this seemed to add to the already staggering pile. It was a pleasant surprise to see a complex subject handled so adroitly. Our congratulations to the editor and contributors for a well balanced and expertly treated handbook on France. (DONALD R. PENN)

MAIER, PAUL L. *Caspar Schwenckfeld on the Person and Work of Christ.* (Assen, The Netherlands: Royal Van Gorcum, Ltd. 1959. Pp. 115. $2.00.)

In order to portray a complete picture of the Reformation, we need a good number of studies such as this, devoted to an analysis of the more or less secondary elements of the period. The importance of Zwingli, Calvin, and Luther is recognized most readily, and the role of the Anabaptists has not been neglected. In addition, however, there were many smaller movements which entered into conflict with these larger divisions, and an understanding of them helps to complete the picture. One such movement was that of Caspar Schwenckfeld (1490-1561) and his theology of the Middle Way. Schwenckfeld was a nobleman and lay reformer from Ossig in Silesia. He was a prolific writer (whose works have been gathered together in seventeen volumes), and the source of inspiration for some 2,000 spiritual descendants—the Schwenckfelders—now living in Pennsylvania.

Maier has given us an over-all view of Schwenckfeld's teaching, but his chief contribution is a valuable and carefully-phrased analysis of the center of this reformer's theology, his Christology and soteriology. This volume will prove most helpful in determining the precise position adopted by Schwenckfeld, the core of whose doctrine was that the humanity of Christ, which lacked creaturity even in this life (the state of humiliation), became gradually more and more "deified," until in heaven (in the state of exaltation), the humanity of the glorified Christ was equated with divinity, and thus became the life-giving source of redemption for mankind.

From an objective point of view, it is difficult to see how Schwenckfeld escaped the charge of Monophysitism which was so often levied against him by Protestant adversaries. He did attempt to explain this accusation away by claiming that the properties of the two natures could be distinguished, even though they could not be separated (p. 64); this was possible, however, only through faith (pp. 62, 77). It may be questioned whether he really solved the difficulty by his complicated reasonings. Maier describes these attempts (in relation to the glorified Christ) as "less than satisfactory" (p. 108); this judgment would seem to be correct, and could probably be extended to the terrestrial state as well. The objectivity with which the author accomplishes his task adds to the usefulness of his book. (JOHN L. MURPHY)

MILLET, BENIGNUS, O.F.M. (Ed.). *Collectanea Hibernica: Sources for Irish History*. No. 2. (Dublin: Clonmore & Reynolds, Ltd. 1959. Pp. 139. $2.00.)

This new periodical, directed by the friars attached to the Franciscan House of Celtic Studies and Historical Research, Dún Mhuire, Killiney, County Dublin, will be devoted exclusively to the publication of sources for Irish history and guides to such sources. The first issue (1958) was Part I of "Catalogue of Material of Irish Interest in the Collection *Nunziatura di Fiandra,* Vatican Archives, Volumes 1-50"; Part II will be published in No. 3 (1960).

In the present volume are seven studies. Canice Mooney, "Letters of Pope Innocent IV Relating to Ireland" (pp. 7-12), prints five copies of minutes of letters of Irish interest from a collection of some 300 such documents in a newly discovered collection of papal letters preserved in Padua, Sant'Antonio, MS. 79. Cuthbert McGrath's "Notes on Í Dhuinne Family" (pp. 13-17) prints six items found on two sheets of paper which form item 8 of MS. A 30 of Dún Mhuire, Killiney. The next three papers are by Brendan Jennings. In "Ecclesiastical Appointments in Ireland, Aug. 1643-Dec. 1649" (pp. 18-65), he prints twelve items relating to appointments made by Rome, for the issuance of which the approbation of Luke Wadding, O.F.M., seems to have been decisive, from MSS. D 1 and D 13 in the Wadding Papers at Dún Mhuire. "Some Correspondence of Father Luke Wadding, O.F.M." (pp. 66-94) reproduces twenty-five letters, nine written by Wadding; four documents, two in Wadding's hand, which are accounts of the sums paid for printing theses defended at solemn disputations and dedicated to notable personages, are reproduced in "Theses Defended at St. Isidore's College, Rome, 1631-1649" (pp. 95-104). Benignus Millet, "Archbishop Edmund O'Reilly's Report on the State of the Church in Ireland, 1662" (pp. 105-114), gives details on the ecclesiastical personnel of the Provinces of Armagh, Dublin, Cashel, and Tuam, describes the plight of the clergy, presents accusations made against O'Reilly and his defense, and suggests remedies for the ills of the Irish Church. In Bartholomew Egan's "Notes on Propaganda Fide Printing-Press and Correspondence concerning Francis Molloy, O.F.M." (pp. 115-124) are printed twelve items from various collections in its archives concerning the Irish fount of the congregation's polyglot press, Molloy, and his Irish works, extending from 1625 to 1707. An index of fifteen pages guides the reader to numerous persons and places identified in this excellently printed and interesting volume. (JOSEPH N. GARVIN)

NEILL, THOMAS P., DANIEL D. MCGARRY, and CLARENCE L. HOHL, JR. *A History of Western Civilization.* Volume I: *From the Beginnings to 1600;* Volume II: *From 1600 to the Present.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1960. Pp. xii, 607, $6.75 and pp. xii, 588-1274, $6.95.)

This new *History of Western Civilization* by three professors at Saint Louis University is printed in double columns and is published in two separate volumes, but with a continuous pagination. The work is divided into nine major units, each furnished with an attractive title, and seventy-four chapters. Each volume has its own index. The maps and illustrations are adequate, but there is no list of illustrations, no list of important dates at the end of either volume, and no genealogical tables. There is one chronological table within the text (I, 36), but there should be others. Furthermore, neither volume contains a preface. Volume II can be welcomed without qualification as a clear, comprehensive, and interesting narrative covering the period from 1600 to the present. The suggested readings are well chosen and are up-to-date. Volume I, however, cannot be recommended without certain reservations. The section on pre-literary foundations (pp. 9-25) is good. On the other hand, the treatment of the Near and Far East (pp. 26-46) is much too short and superficial and contains some inaccuracies. Greek history (pp. 47-77) and Roman history, including the history of early Christianity (pp. 78-134), are likewise presented in a much too sketchy form. In a text intended primarily for Catholic college students, one would expect a much fuller account of Hebrew history, and especially of the religion of the Old Testament, and a much more detailed treatment of the early Church. The suggested readings on pages 46, 77, 97, 133-134, and 146 are in part out-of-date and partly inadequate in other respects. It is a pleasure to state, however, that the units devoted to the Middle Ages, the Renaissance, and Religious Revolt and Reform (pp. 147-587) are in proper proportion and, in general, are very good. The suggested readings in these units are well selected and up-to-date. All in all, apart from weaknesses in the sections devoted to antiquity, it is a college text that deserves to be recommended. (MARTIN R. P. McGUIRE)

PARHAM, ALTHÉA DE PUECH (Ed. and Trans.). *My Odyssey. Experiences of a Young Refugee from Two Revolutions by a Creole of Saint Dominique*. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. Pp. xxvi, 204. $4.95.)

Mrs. Althéa de Puech Parham has here edited and translated the French journal kept by a young refugee from the French Revolution and an active participant in the revolution in Saint Domingue (now Haiti). The young author-poet of *My Odyssey,* whose name is not given, was born in Saint Domingue and educated in France. At sixteen he fled France only to be plunged into the revolutionary atrocities which had crossed the Atlantic to the island of his birth. He described vividly in both prose and poetry the violence in the smitten island and wrote from the viewpoint of the wealthy French planter class. His medley of prose and neo-classical verse, and self-revelation, containing passages of description, humor, and self-revelation, is characteristic of the eighteenth-century society.

Nobody has ever been to the West Indies who will fail to appreciate the author's gaiety, enthusiasm, and aliveness in portraying the events in the last decade of the eighteenth century and the first few years of the nineteenth century. The reader lives again with the charming creole who has left such a rich picture of his life and experiences. Gratitude is owed to Mrs. Parham for sharing *My Odyssey* with others. Her excellent translation from the original French has provided valuable source material whose irony and proportion prevent pompousness. (JANET B. J. BAKER)

PURCELL, MARY. *St. Anthony and His Times.* (New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc. 1960. Pp. 282. $3.95.)

This is Miss Purcell's sixth book, and will undoubtedly enjoy the same success that has come to her other works, the best of which, perhaps, was *The First Jesuit, St. Ignatius Loyola.* To write a biography of St. Anthony of Padua is no easy task. Little enough concerning him has come down to us, and a great part even of this is under dispute. The author has recorded some manuscript source materials apparently not previously employed. As such, they must of their very nature be regarded as important; nevertheless, they are not such as to shed any extraordinary new lights upon the subject. Miss Purcell does a passable job of scholarly research, but that is not her forte; she is at her best in weighing the results of the researches of others, in summarizing, and in providing a synthesis of the labors of others—an ability neither common nor without its own merit. Her style is precise and to the point, eloquent without being obscured by undue elegance. Her descriptions of the country around Lisbon are so vivid that it is evident she speaks as one who has visited the places she describes. Her task was a difficult one, and she has acquitted herself of it quite admirably.

We could wish, however, to have been given some further information on what must have been a rather important phase of St. Anthony's life as a Franciscan; viz., the fundamental conflict between a man of some learning—not great learning, but at least of scholarly habits—and a religious order which in its founding principles failed to recognize the value of learning as an adjunct to sanctity. We could have wished to see how it was that this conflict, which took others into heresy, carried Anthony to higher sanctity. In all, this problem is skirted rather neatly. If this is a defect, however, it is not an extraordinarily important one, and we do not hesitate to recommend the work highly for lighter reading. (W. A. JURGENS)

SHERIDAN, PHILIP JOHN. *Francisco de Miranda. Forerunner of Spanish-American Independence.* (San Antonio: Naylor Co. 1960. Pp. xii, 83. $3.00.)

Francisco de Miranda is certainly one of the more fascinating of the precursors in the Latin American independence movement, but in this sketchy, strictly biographical account, whether or not this work will be of any value for the high-school student of Latin American history, is debatable. Awkwardly written with little depth, and drawn mainly from Robertson's work, it is certainly a disappointing study. There has been little or no attempt on the part of the author to look at Miranda and his times and form some framework or perspective from which to deal with the subject. Material is inserted without consideration as to its pertinence, and the author makes no attempt to view or evaluate critically the more important happenings in Miranda's life.

Francesco de Miranda was one of those eighteenth-century dabblers, a many-sided, complex figure who reflected all of the confusion, cross-currents, surging forces of the Enlightenment. In his travels, writings, acquaintances, and in his experiences one can, perhaps, gain fuller understanding of the Age of Reason, with its profound impact on the course of

Latin American history. But Miranda must be placed in his age, and an attempt made to indicate with depth those influences which molded and shaped him, along with his own influence upon his times. That this is difficult, given Miranda and his age, is understandable. Nevertheless, a strictly chronological, condensed, and factual approach such as this one leaves a great deal to be desired. Such treatment for a figure of Miranda's stature is not only disappointing, it is tragic. (JOSEPH A. ELLIS)

SITWELL, SACHEVERELL and TONY ARMSTRONG-JONES. *Malta.* (London: B. T. Batsford, Ltd. 1958. Pp. xi, 131. $8.00.)

What is essentially travel literature and colorful descriptions of seventeenth and eighteenth-century palaces of the order of mediaeval knights who once resided on Malta, has been expanded into the field of history in another volume entitled simply: *Malta.* Sir Sacheverell is the author of many such books on other countries and he has given a fresh approach to history and the golden age of courtly life on this Mediterranean island by stimulating our imagination. Moreover, he has related the activity of the knights to other European countries.

Ties to Russia and Spain are less known than those to France and Italy. Not only does he examine the customs and art, but also the vocabulary of the times. Fresh vigor is given to an old subject by introducing the Spanish abbess who presided over a convent of noble ladies. In archaeology the author opens up questions of Malta's ancient ties to Pantelleria, which are usually ignored.

Keen interest in this book will develop this year as the Maltese celebrate the 1900th year since St. Paul landed on Malta and founded one of Europe's earliest dioceses. (HARRISON SMITH)

STOUTENBURGH, JOHN L., JR. *Dictionary of the American Indian.* (New York: Philosophical Library. 1960. Pp. 462. $10.00.)

A publisher's advertisement calls this volume "an up-to-date source book for the student, researcher, or individual who wants a clear, unbiased picture of the American Indian." It is a "comprehensive work," the ad continues, one that "can serve as a dependable source of information" about Indian history and Indian lore. If the book lived up to these claims, it would, indeed, be a welcome addition to the ever-growing library on the American Indian. Unfortunately, it is of quite another character. The *Dictionary* has 462 pages with about eight items to a page and represents a considerable amount of work. But the contents are far from comprehensive and comprise what seem to be merely haphazard accumulations of data. On the one hand, the author gives the meaning of many Indian words, which are taken from a variety of tribes and by no means furnish a complete vocabulary; on the other, he neglects vital phases of Indian history and culture, and those he includes are not satisfactorily handled. The definitions and descriptions themselves are written in undistinguished, occasionally ungrammatical prose; although some of them make entertaining reading, they cannot generally be classed as dependable sources of information. (Francis Paul Prucha)

Toynbee, Arnold J., and Edward D. Myers. *A Study of History,* Volume XI: *Historical Atlas and Gazeteer.* (London and New York: Oxford University Press. 1959. Pp. xi, 257. $12.50.)

This quarto volume contains a gazeteer of all place-names mentioned in *A Study of History,* I-X; an atlas containing a series of maps grouped under the following heads: I, Synoptic Views of Civilizations and Higher Religions; II, Primary Civilizations in the Old World; III, Secondary Civilizations in the Old World; IV, Tertiary Civilizations in the Old World; V, Civilizations in the New World; a long appendix dealing with the problem of the location of Hittite place-names on Maps 15-16; and an index to the maps. References are given to Somervell's *Abridgments of a Study of History* as well as to the original work.

The editors, with the help of an expert staff, have produced an excellent gazeteer and atlas which will render valuable service as a general reference tool as well as an indispensable help to readers of *A Study of History.* The appendix on the location of Hittite place-names would hardly be looked for in a work of this kind, but it is a most welcome up-to-date treatment of a difficult problem. The typography and cartography are excellent, and the price for such a work is reasonable. (Martin R. P. McGuire)

Ulanov, Barry. *Sources and Resources, The Literary Traditions of Christian Humanism.* (Westminster: Newman Press. 1960. Pp. xv, 286. $4.50.)

Two decades ago men spoke of little else but the "crisis of our age." Today it is of "the great dialogue" of "our time." They have come a very long way: western man's characteristic on-going search for a "crisis" transcending principle (and focus) of order has, once again, been driven across the threshold of dynamic articulation. As at every stage on the way, from Plato to the present, he is, through the great intellects of "the time," re-encountering God through a "discovery" of a new dimension of his own being: a realm which it is ever the function of art to delineate.

Indeed, every such discovery necessitates an encounter with God Who has made man in His image to know, love, and serve Him. Such encounters have always produced visions of reality which transcend the limitations which are the very essence of a "time of crisis." Barry Ulanov, who —perhaps significantly—made his literary debut as an authority upon jazz, undertakes to demonstrate that when those through whom the "encounter" took place endeavored to communicate "their vision" (Dostoyevsky would have said "my truth") it took the form of Augustinian rhetoric. In doing so he has done us the real service of surveying the "sources and resources"—ultimately the "personal encounters"—of Christian humanism. Such transcendings have always accomplished a "recovery" of the fullness of our heritage and that is the author's orienting concern in this study.

We are literally swamped with studies related to "the dialogue of our time," but the dialogue itself tends to focus upon, and revolve around a mere handful. Mr. Ulanov's book may well take its place among them —along with Camus' *The Rebel,* H. Stuart Hughes' *Consciousness and Society,* and one or two of the basic writings of Martin Buber. An encounter with God (or Christ) has always been a mutual "Thou art"—to which we give the name of Love. Such a book does much to restore our faith in man's adequacy to the contemporary challenge with which his Maker has seen fit to confront him. It should be read widely in our colleges and universities. (ELDON M. TALLEY)

VAN DER HEYDEN, A.A.M. and H. H. SCULLARD (Eds.). *Atlas of the Classical World.* (London and New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons. 1959. Pp. 221. $15.00.)

This *Atlas* follows the general pattern of the *Atlas of the Bible* (1956) and the *Atlas of the Early Christian World* (1958) and maintains the same high standard of excellence. It contains 475 gravure plates, seventy-three maps in six colors, a 60,000-word descriptive text, and a twenty-four-page index. The illustrations, including many aerial photographs specially made for the *Atlas* through the co-operation of the governments and air forces of Greece and Italy, are splendidly reproduced. The maps contain a number of new and most welcome features. The following maps deserve formal mention: 2, Climate and Minerals in the Mediterranean World; 17-18, Greek Buildings in the Mediterranean Area; 24-25, the Gods of the Greeks—The Cult Centres of the Greek Gods; 41-42, The Legions; 45, Troop Movements. History of Four Legions; 58-59, The System of Centuriation—Transport of Animals for the Arenas of Rome; 68, Amphitheatres, Stadiums, and Hippodromes in the Roman Empire; 70, The Influence of Roman Legal Institutions on Later Legal Systems;

71, Theatres and Odeums in the Roman Empire; 72, The Most Important Greek Scholars and Authors; 73, The Most Important Writers Who Used the Latin Language. The text is closely co-ordinated with the maps and plates; it is accurate, well-written, and long enough to give a great deal of concrete information. The final section, entitled "The Heritage of Classical Culture," is an unusually good evaluation of the Greco-Roman achievement and its lasting influence. Like its two predecessors, this is an excellent work. It is scholarly and authoritative, but it is also a book which is a joy to leaf through as well as to study in detail. (MARTIN R. P. MCGUIRE)

WARD, LEO R., C.S.C. *Catholic Life, U.S.A.: Contemporary Lay Movements.* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1959. Pp. 263. $3.95.)

Father Ward wrote this book to give people of various faiths, those in high schools and colleges especially, a quick over-all look at some of the contemporary Catholic lay movements in the United States. He admits that during the last twenty-five years he has "followed with sympathy the inception and growth of every one" (p. 9) of the movements he considers —the liturgical movement, the Christian family, the Cana conferences, the study of the layman's vocation, the sister formation, the Grail movement, the National Councils of Catholic Men and Women, the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, interracial communities, Dorothy Day's houses of hospitality, and the Catholic Rural Life Conference. In a breezy style he treats each topic in approximately twenty pages, giving a general account of the nature and aims of the organizations and a detailed treatment of the techniques used by one or more (usually two) groups in each category that he has judged after close observation to be more or less effectively reaching the objectives that have been established. While reading some of the chapters the reviewer got the impression that he was listening to a born optimist preaching a sermon.

In a "Brief Selected Bibliography," divided according to chapters, Father Ward has listed books (published before 1958) and magazines that will enable the reader to put some more flesh on the skeleton. The index is complete. The author probably decided against the use of footnotes to make it appear less formidable to the audience he hoped to reach. For this reason, and because of the generally uncritical approach, serious scholars will not find the book very useful. But many of the people to whom the author addressed himself will be grateful to such an enthusiastic and zealous priest for spreading so much good news about the American Church. At the same time some of them may wonder, as I did, why he did not speak about the Young Christian Students and the Young Christian Workers; movements which, to my mind, would be of special interest to his general theme. (PATRICK H. AHERN)

WHITEHALL, WALTER MUIR. *Boston. A Topographical History.* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. 1959. Pp. xxix, 244. $4.95.)

In the spring of 1958 at the Lowell Institute, Boston, Mr. Whitehill delivered a series of eight lectures on Boston's topographical changes since the English first came to Massachusetts Bay. The talks were based largely on walks about the city and on research in the extensive book and print collection of the Boston Athenaeum, of which the author is the librarian. They are here attractively printed and supplemented by an unusual collection of maps, plans, sketches, and photographs of the changing face of the old city. More than a topographical history, this book supplies information on Boston's religious and cultural institutions and, because of the author's extensive study of architecture, provides a guide to the city's buildings and monuments that is expert. A list of the illustrations with an explanation of each and the source of the original is given at the front of the book. Consistent with the current, irritating practice, notes are gathered by chapters at the rear of the volume. An appendix provides a chronological list of some of the surviving historical sites and monuments mentioned in the text. An adequate index completes the book.

Boston's story has been competently told before, but Mr. Whitehill's account is so urbane that this book should be a welcome and helpful guide both for residents and for visitors to the city. The unusual number, variety, and fidelity of the illustrations further set this book apart. The title, however, is misleading. This is not a topographical history of Boston, but restricts itself quite exclusively to the Boston peninsula. Almost no mention is made of the interesting and extensive changes in South Boston, East Boston, Dorchester, or other areas of the sprawling city. (JOHN A. BRODERICK)

WILKINS, ERNEST H. *Petrarch's Later Years.* (Cambridge: Mediaeval Academy of America. 1959. Pp. xiv, 322. $8.00.)

In the present volume Dr. Wilkins discusses in considerable detail the life and works of Petrarch during the closing years of his life, from 1361 to 1374. Following the pattern which he established in previous volumes, the author does not attempt to interpret his evidence against the background of the period, but contents himself with a critical examination of more specific questions. He attempts to establish dates for letters, to explore personal relationships, and to evaluate the mass of evidence relating to the poet's writings. The meticulous care with which he handles this task is evident on every page of his work.

Dr. Wilkins has shown on numerous occasions his deep insight into the life and works of the poet; here he devotes himself to an almost microscopic investigation of details. The weakness of this technique lies not so much with the book itself as with its readers. Only the specialist can approach this book confident that he can fill in the background needed for full understanding. In a way, it is unfortunate that Dr. Wilkins was writing here chiefly for the specialist; he has frustrated those of us who fall into the great abyss of "general" readers and who can only appreciate from afar or after much study the truly monumental character of his work. (James M. Powell)

Arnade, Charles W. *Florida On Trial, 1593-1602.* (Coral Gables: University of Florida Press. 1959. Pp. viii, 100. $1.00.)

The author of this absorbing brochure has woven together the eyewitness accounts of the colonists and officials of Spanish Florida in response to a pre-determined list of questions. The year was 1602, and the fate of the settlement of St. Augustine, and consequently of all Florida, was to be resolved by the outcome of this examination. The method used by the authorities of the crown was an investigation in the form of a trial. The intent of the interrogation was the specific facts, and not the general accusations of the residents, concerning the general state of this district in the colonial empire. This exposition of the sixteenth-century crisis was not an extraordinary event in the recorded annals of Spanish administration.

A constant mark of the colonial system of Spain was a distrust of the settlers and officials sent by the government to her vast American empire. There was the fear of expending men and money on a territory which could not pay its own way. In this monograph an account is given of one of the many ways in which this was manifested. The vast extent of the overseas territories and the slowness of communications constituted major problems of effective control to the royal officials and misuse of power by some was a perennial threat. The result was the institution of means of this kind for controlling the actions of distant officers.

Florida On Trial can be read with pleasure for its narration, penetrating glimpses and comments of early Florida, and for the high level of scholarly documentation and reporting. (Peter Covas)

PERIODICAL LITERATURE

GENERAL

Los intelectuales y la Iglesia. Friedrich Heer (*Arbor,* Apr., 1960, pp. 7-23).

The Archiepiscopal Archives at Amalfi. Robert Brentano (*Manuscripta,* July, 1960, pp. 98-105).

Die kulturellen Leistungen des Benediktinerordens in den Donauländern. Virgil Redlich (*Der Donauraum,* Heft 2, 1960, pp. 65-77).

El Ejecutivo y el Legislativo en las Ordenes religiosas. Léo Moulin (*Revista de Estudios Políticos,* July-Aug., 1959, pp. 103-128).

Validità della tesi gerseniana sull' autore della *Imitazione di Cristo.* Tiburzio Lupo (*Salesianum,* Jan.-Mar., 1960, pp. 56-106).

Luther Research since 1920. Harold J. Grimm (*Journal of Modern History,* June, 1960, pp. 105-118).

Calvinism, Capitalism, and the Middle Classes: Some Afterthoughts on an Old Problem. Sidney A. Burrell (*Journal of Modern History,* June, 1960, pp. 129-141).

Studies in Calvinism since 1955. Edward A. Dowey, Jr. (*Church History,* June, 1960, pp. 187-204).

Canonical Doctrine Concerning Mixed Marriages before Trent and during the Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries. Alfred J. Connick (*Jurist,* July, 1960, pp. 295-326).

Some Neglected Spanish Social Thinkers. T. Lynn Smity (*Americas,* July, 1960, pp. 37-52).

Les Nonces en France. Wladimir d'Ormesson (*La Revue des Deux Mondes,* May, 1960, pp. 204-218).

Les publications bibliques catholiques en langue japonaise (1859-1959). P. L. Van Hecken, C.I.C.M. (*Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft,* XVI, 2, 1960, pp. 81-94).

Writings on the History of Religion in the United States, 1959. Edward R. Vollmar (*Manuscripta,* July, 1960, pp. 90-97).

ANTIQUITY

Das Problem der Zeit in der voraugustinischen Theologie. Stephan Otto (*Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie,* Heft 1, 1960, pp. 74-87).

The Lord's Supper in the Third Century. George W. Dollar (*Bibliotheca Sacra,* July, 1960, pp. 249-257).

Faith and Order at the Council of Nicaea. Henry Chadwick (*Harvard Theological Review,* July, 1960, pp. 171-195).

L'empereur Constantin converti par Euphratas. François Halkin (*Analecta Bollandiana,* Tomus LXXVIII, Fasc. I-II, 1960, pp. 5-17).

Les martyrs Eugène et Macaire, morts en exil en Maurétanie. Baudouin de Gaiffier (*Analecta Bollandiana,* Tomus LXXVIII, Fasc. I-II, 1960, pp. 24-40).

La Passion grecque des saints Eugène et Macaire. François Halkin (*Analecta Bollandiana,* Tomus LXXVIII, Fasc. I-II, 1960, pp. 41-52).

El nominalismo arriano y la filosofía cristiana: Eunomio y San Basilio. Angel Benito y Durán (*Augustinus,* Apr.-June, 1960, pp. 207-226).

St. Basil and the Greeks. Frederick H. Brigham, Jr. (*Classical Folia,* Vol. XIV, No. 1, pp. 35-38).

L'*Ecclesia-Virgo* et les *Sanctimoniales* d'après saint Augustin. M. Agterberg, O.E.S.A. (*Augustiniana,* Apr., 1960, pp. 5-35).

San Agustín y el monaquismo africano. Andrés Manrique, O.S.A. (*La Ciudad de Dios,* Jan.-Mar., 1960, pp. 118-138).

Ideario político de San Agustín. Font Puig (*Augustinus,* Apr.-June, 1960, pp. 163-174).

John Cassian. Peter Munz (*Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* Apr., 1960, pp. 1-22).

La Passion de S. Patrocle de Troyes. Ses sources. Joseph van der Straeten (*Analecta Bollandiana,* Tomus LXXVIII, Fasc. I-II, 1960, pp. 145-153).

La basilique chrétienne d'Hippone d'après le résultat des dernières fouilles. Henri-Irénée Marrou (*Revue des Études Augustiniennes,* VI-2, 1960, pp. 109-154).

MIDDLE AGES

Paganism to Christianity in Anglo-Saxon England. William A. Chaney (*Harvard Theological Review,* July, 1960, pp. 197-217).

Virgile de Salzbourg en Irlande. Paul Grosjean (*Analecta Bollandiana,* Tomus LXXVIII, Fasc. I-II, 1960, pp. 92-123).

Les deux Passions de S. Patrice, évêque de Pruse en Bithynie. François Halkin (*Analecta Bollandiana,* Tomus LXXVIII, Fasc. I-II, 1960, pp. 130-144).

Audradus von Sens. Prophet und Kirchenpolitiker (um 850). Walter Mohr (*Bulletin du Cange, Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi,* Tome XXIX, Fasc. 2-3, pp. 239-267).

Patriarch Photius, Scholar and Statesman (continued). Francis Dvornik (*Classical Folia,* Vol. XIV, No. 1, 1960, pp. 3-22).

Le Placitum feretranum de 885 et les origines de Saint-Marin. P. Aebischer (*Le Moyen Age,* No. 1-2, 1960, pp. 1-36).

Untersuchungen zur Frühzeit des französischen Fürstentums, 9.-10. Jahrhundert (Schluss). Karl Ferdinand Werner (*Die Welt als Geschichte,* Heft 2, 1960, pp. 87-119).

Prières mariales du X^e siècle. H. Barré, C.S.Sp. (*Ephemerides Mariologicae,* Vol. X, Fasc. 2, 1960, pp. 195-221).

"Prior" e "praepositus" nella *Vita Odonis* di Giovanni Romano. Girolamo Arnaldi (*Bulletin du Cange, Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi,* Tome XXIX, Fasc. 2-3, pp. 167-171).

Some Latin Charters of the Tenth Century Reformation in England. E. John (*Revue Bénédictine,* Tome LXX, No. 2, 1960, pp. 333-359).

The Prayer-Book of Archbishop Arnulph II of Milan. D. H. Turner (*Revue Bénédictine,* Tome LXX, No. 2, 1960, pp. 360-392).

Précisions sur la date et l'ordonnance primitive du Pontifical romano-germanique. C. Vogel (*Ephemerides Liturgicae,* Vol. LXXIV, Fasc. III, pp. 145-162).

Klunys Bräuche zur Zeit Hugos des Grossen (1049-1109). Kassius Hallinger (*Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte,* LXXVI, Kan. Abt. XLV, pp. 99-140).

Bérenger de Tours contre Albéric du Mont-Cassin. P. Meyvaert (*Revue Bénédictine,* Tome LXX, No. 2, 1960, pp. 324-332).

The Gregorian Ideal and Saint Bernard of Clairvaux. Hayden V. White (*Journal of the History of Ideas,* July-Sept., 1960, pp. 321-348).

English Influence on Danish Monasticism [Twelfth Century]. C. A. J. France (*Downside Review,* Summer, 1960, pp. 181-191).

La prétendue canonisation d'Aelred de Rievaux par Célestin III. Paul Grosjean (*Analecta Bollandiana,* Tomus LXXVIII, Fasc. I-II, 1960, pp. 124-129).

Das Leiden Christi im Leben des hl. Franziskus von Assisi. Eine quellenvergleichende Untersuchung im Lichte der zeitgenössischen Passionsfrömmigkeit. II. Teil. Oktavian von Rieden, O.F.M. Cap. (*Collectanea Franciscana,* Tomus 30, Fasc. 3, 1960, pp. 241-263).

Fr. Ioannes de Celano, O.F.M. S. Francisci Assisiensis biographus coaevus. Anicetus Chiappini, O.F.M. (*Antonianum,* Apr., 1960, pp. 339-342).

La cistercienne Catherine de Louvain fut-elle abbesse de Parc-les-Dames ? Émile Brouette (*Analecta Bollandiana,* Tomus LXXVIII, Fasc. I-II, 1960, pp. 84-91).

L'autorité pontificale selon Innocent IV. M. Pacaut (*Le Moyen Age,* Nos. 1-2, 1960, pp. 85-120).

The Thirteenth Century and the Ideas of Marsilius of Padua. Peter Munz (*Historical Studies. Australia and New Zealand,* May, 1960, pp. 156-172).

Thomas Aquinas and Raymundus Lullus. Martin Anton Schmidt (*Church History,* June, 1960, pp. 123-140).

L'allégorie chrétienne dans les récits relatifs au Wineland. J. H. and L. L. Hill (*Le Moyen Age,* Nos. 1-2, 1960, pp. 65-84).

Los judios del Reino de Mallorca durante los siglos XIII y XIV. Antonio Pons (*Hispania,* Jan.-Mar., 1960, pp. 3-54).

English Spiritual Writers. XIX: The Cloud of Unknowing. Gerard Sitwell, O.S.B. (*Clergy Review,* July, 1960, pp. 385-394).

The Reply of a Fourteenth-century Abbot of Bury St. Edmunds to a Man's Petition to be a Recluse. Antonia Gransden (*English Historical Review,* July, 1960, pp. 464-467).

Documents pour servir à l'histoire médiévale de la province augustinienne de Cologne. Extraits des registres des prieurs généraux (1357-1506) (à suivre) N. Teeuwen, O.E.S.A.—A. de Meijer, O.E.S.A. (*Augustiniana,* Apr., 1960, pp. 178-184).

Pluralists in the Province of Canterbury in 1366. C. J. Godfrey (*Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* Apr., 1960, pp. 23-40).

El Alcalde entre moros y cristianos del Reino de Murcia. Juan Torres Fontes (*Hispania,* Jan.-Mar., 1960, pp. 55-80).

RENAISSANCE AND REFORMATION

The Hussite Movement and the Czech Reformation. F. Kavka (*Journal of World History,* Vol. V, No. 4, 1960, pp. 830-856).

De historico faustoque conventu Occidentis cum Oriente christiano [1439]. Gualbertus Matteucci, O.F.M. (*Antonianum,* Apr., 1960, pp. 293-322).

Pius II. und die Gründung der Universität Basel. Die Stiftungsbulle vom 12. November 1459. Ernst Staehelin (*Theologische Zeitschrift,* May-June, 1960, pp. 172-175).

La biblioteca de Don Luis de Acuña en 1496. Nicolás López Martínez (*Hispania,* Jan.-Mar., 1960, pp. 81-110).

Sources for a History of the English Austin Friars. III. The Fifteenth Century. Francis Roth, O.E.S.A. (*Augustiniana,* Apr., 1960, pp. 294-340).

Clerical Taxation in England, 1485 to 1547. J. J. Scarisbrick (*Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* Apr., 1960, pp. 41-54).

Grosswesir Ahmet Herzeg Geheimchrist im Hof des Sultans zu Istanbul. P. Joannou (*Orientalia Christiana Periodica,* Vol. XXVI, Fasc. 1, 1960, pp. 74-80).

I corsari in Mediterraneo all'inizio del cinquecento. Alberto Tenenti (*Revista Storica Italiana,* Anno LXXII, Fasc. II, 1960, pp. 234-287).

La Rome de Jules II. Maurice Andrieux (*La Revue des Deux Mondes,* June, 1960, pp. 505-515).

Archbishop Blackader in Venice. Rosamund J. Mitchell (*Bollettino dell'istituto di storia della società e dello stato veneziano,* I, 1959, pp. 169-178).

The Problem of Giles of Viterbo. A historiographical survey. F. X. Martin, O.E.S.A. (*Augustiniana,* Apr., 1960, pp. 43-60).

La chrétienté déchirée et la maison de Savoie (1521-1522). Henri Naef (*Zeitschrift für schweizerische Kirchengeschichte,* Heft 1, 1960, pp. 29-52).

The Trial of Thomas More. Philip Ingress Bell (*Month,* June, 1960, pp. 325-339).

The Last Abbots of Reading and Colchester. J. E. Paul (*Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research,* May, 1960, pp. 115-121).

The good name of Martin Ponthus. N. Z. Davis (*Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance,* Apr., 1960, pp. 287-293).

Tolérance et intolérance religieuses au XVI^e^ siècle. L. Cristiani (*Journal of World History,* Vol. V, No. 4, 1960, pp. 857-878).

The Council of Trent. H. O. Evennett (*Blackfriars,* June, 1960, pp. 198-206).

Scripture and Tradition in the Council of Trent. Richard Baepler (*Concordia Theological Monthly,* June, 1960, pp. 341-362).

Episcopat et Hiérarchie au Concile de Trente. J. Pegon, S.J. (*Nouvelle Revue Theólogique,* June, 1960, pp. 580-588).

The Effect of the Council of Trent on the Episcopal Tenure of Duke Ernst of Bavaria, Archbishop-Confirmed of Salzburg, in 1554. Felix F. Strauss (*Journal of Modern History,* June, 1960, pp. 119-128).

Exercice du droit de visite dans les paroisses rurales du diocèse de Toulouse au lendemain du Concile de Trente. G. Baccrabère (*Revue de Droit Canonique,* Mar., 1960, pp. 3-26).

The Struggle for Constitutional Government in the Early Years of the Society of Jesus. Guenter Lewy (*Church History,* June, 1960, pp. 141-160).

La société vénitienne et la Reforme protestante au XVI^{e} siècle. Edouard Pommier (*Bollettino dell'istituto di storia della società e dello stato veneziano,* I, 1959, pp. 3-26).

"De perfectione rerum" di Nicolò Contarini. Alberto Tenenti (*Bollettino dell'istituto di storia della società e dello stato veneziano,* I, 1959, pp. 155-167).

Los estudios del Beato Juan de Ribera en la Universidad de Salamanca. F. Marcos Rodriguez (*Salmanticensis,* Vol. 7, Fasc. 1, pp. 85-99).

El Colegio Salmanticense, O.C.D., y la Universidad de Salamanca. Enrique del Sdo. Corazón, O.C.D. (*Ephemerides Carmeliticae,* Annus XI, Fasc. 1, 1960, pp. 127-175).

Autonomia und Pacis Compositio. Martin Heckel (*Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte,* LXXVI, Kan. Abt. XLV, pp. 141-277).

Die Denkschrift des Paul Hoffaeus, S.I. De unione animorum in Societate. Pietro Pirri, S.I. (*Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu,* Jan.-June, 1960, pp. 99-129).

The Embassy of Sir Anthony Standen in 1603. Part II. L. Hicks, S.J. (*Recusant History,* Apr., 1960, pp. 184-222).

Paolo Sarpi tra il cattolico Philippe Canaye de Fresnes e il calvinista Isaac Casaubon. Gaetano Cozzi (*Bollettino dell'istituto di storia della società e dello stato veneziano,* I, 1959, pp. 27-154).

St. Francis of Sales and the Hermits of Mont Voiron. Stanley G. A. Luff (*Irish Ecclesiastical Record,* June, 1960, pp. 366-378).

Paolo Sarpi e Jan van Meurs. Gaetano Cozzi (*Bollettino dell'istituto di storia della società e dello stato veneziano,* I, 1959, pp. 179-186).

Proyecto de una misión de la Orden de San Agustín en Arabia (1624-1629). C. Alonso, O.E.S.A. (*Augustiniana,* Apr., 1960, pp. 61-76).

MODERN

The Baroque Age. Carl J. Friedrich (*Horizon,* July, 1960, pp. 33-64).

Denis Petau e la cronologia. Pietro Di Rosa, S.I. (*Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu,* Jan.-June, 1960, pp. 3-54).

Fundación y fábrica de San Antonio de Almendralejo en la Provincia de San Gabriel. Arcángel Barrado, O.F.M. (*Archivo Ibero-Americano,* Apr.-June, 1960, pp. 141-166).

Jésuites gallicans au XVII siècle? A propos de l'ouvrage du P. Guitton sur le P. de La Chaize. Pierre Blet, S.I. (*Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu,* Jan.-June, 1960, pp. 55-84).

La publication officielle de la bulle *In eminenti* (1651-1653) (à suivre). L. Ceyssens, O.F.M. (*Augustiniana,* Apr., 1960, pp. 77-114).

The Death of Stephen Faber, S.J. Apostle of Shensi, China. Francis A. Rouleau, S.I. (*Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu,* Jan.-June, 1960, pp. 130-148).

Le Tricentenaire de Monsieur Vincent. Daniel-Rops (*La Revue des Deux Mondes,* June, 1960, pp. 385-402).

La vie profonde de Monsieur Vincent. R. Rouquette (*Études,* July-Aug., 1960, pp. 3-22).

Clarendon and the Declaration of Indulgence. George R. Abernathy, Jr. (*Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* Apr., 1960, pp. 55-73).

The Cistercian Reform and the General Chapter of 1667. L. J. Lekai (*Revue Bénédictine,* Tome LXX, No. 2, 1960, pp. 393-409).

Estado de la Provincia [Franciscana] de Cantabria en el siglo XVII. Angel Uribe, O.F.M. (*Archivo Ibero-Americano,* Apr.-June, 1960, pp. 205-242).

Anatom und Bischof: Niels Stensen. Robert Braun (*Hochland,* June, 1960, pp. 432-440).

San Gregorio Barbarigo. F. Cavilli, S.I. (*La Civiltà Cattolica,* June 4, 1960, pp. 463-476).

Lord Burlington and Fr. Ripa's Chinese Engravings. Basil Gray (*British Museum Quarterly,* Feb., 1960, pp. 40-43).

La résidence des Pères Capucins au Mont St. Michel à Blizne (1760-1788). Kornel Gadacz, O.F.M. Cap. (*Collectanea Franciscana,* Tomus 30, Fasc. 3, 1960, pp. 303-333).

La restitución de las reservas pontificias sobre impedimentos matrimoniales en la correspondencia Godoy-Azara (1796-1798). Luis Sierra, S.I. (*Hispania,* Jan.-Mar., 1960, pp. 111-133).

Le mouvement catéchistique en France au XIX^e siècle. P. Broutin, S.J. (*Nouvelle Revue Théologique,* May, June, 1960, pp. 494-512, 607-632).

Die Cistercienser-Abtei Wettingen 1803-1815. Anton Kottmann (*Zeitschrift für schweizerische Kirchengeschichte,* Heft 1, 1960, pp. 1-28).

The Nature of the *Avenir* Movement (1830-1831). Peter N. Stearns (*American Historical Review,* July, 1960, pp. 837-847).

The Whigs and the Church Establishment in the Age of Grey and Holland. G. F. A. Best (*History,* June, 1960, pp. 103-118).

Die Anfänge der katholisch-konservativen Tagespresse in der Schweiz. E. F. J. Müller-Büchi (*Zeitschrift für schweizerische Kirchengeschichte,* Heft 1, 1960, pp. 53-67).

Bishop James Quinn: From Dublin to Brisbane. Cornelius Roberts (*Australasian Catholic Record,* Apr., 1960, pp. 116-122).

La Constituyente de 1854. Diego Sevilla Andrés (*Revista de Estudios Politicos,* July-Aug., 1959, pp. 129-166).

Acton: The Youthful Parliamentarian. J. J. Auchmuty (*Historical Studies. Australia and New Zealand,* May, 1960, pp. 131-139).

Con Odo Russell a Roma nel 1860. Noel Blakiston (*Rassegna Storica del Risorgimento,* Jan.-Mar., 1960, pp. 61-68).

L'Église et le rattachement de la Savoie à la France. Daniel-Rops (*Etudes,* June, 1960, pp. 289-302).

The Intelligentsia and the Religion of Humanity. James H. Billington (*American Historical Review,* July, 1960, pp. 807-821).

Preparation of the Vatican Council's Schema on the Power and Nature of the Primacy. W. F. Dewan (*Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses,* Tomus XXXVI, Fasc. I, 1960, pp. 23-56).

Ireland at the Vatican Council. Peadar MacSuibhne (*Irish Ecclesiastical Record,* May, 1960, pp. 295-307).

AMERICAN

Cristóbal Cabrera (c. 1515-1598), First American Author: A Check List of His Writings in the Vatican Library. Ernest J. Burrus (*Manuscripta,* July, 1960, pp. 67-89).

Fray Bartolomé de las Casas und die Gründung der Mission in der Verapaz (Guatemala). Benno Biermann, O.P. (*Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft,* XVI, 2, 1960, pp. 110-123).

Sixteenth Century English-Spanish Rivalry in La Florida. J. Leitch Wright, Jr. (*Florida Historical Quarterly,* Apr., 1960, pp. 265-279).

Forced Labor in Colonial Peru. David L. Wiedner (*Americas,* Apr., 1960, pp. 357-384).

The Painter, Mateo Mexía, and his Works in the Convent of San Francisco de Quito. José de Mesa and Teresa Gisbert (*Americas,* Apr., 1960, pp. 385-396).

Father Gonzalo Tenorio, O.F.M., and his Providentialist Eschatological Theories on the Spanish Indies. Antonio Eguiluz (*Americas,* Apr., 1960, pp. 329-356).

Caminho de Chiquitos às Missões Guaranis (1690 a 1780). Ensaio interpretativo (continuação). Eulália Maria Lahmeyer Lobo (*Revista de História,* Jan.-Mar., 1960, pp. 85-90).

Navaho-Spanish Diplomacy, 1770-1790. Frank D. Reeve (*New Mexico Historical Review,* July, 1960, pp. 200-235).

The 1789 Saint Augustine Celebration. Helen Hornbeck Tanner (*Florida Historical Quarterly,* Apr., 1960, pp. 280-293).

Informe de las Misiones de California. (*Boletin del Archivo General de la Nacion,* Tomo XXX, 2, 1959, pp. 231-284).

Los Jesuítas y la Independencia de América. Juan Manuel Pacheco (*Revista Javeriana,* July, 1960, pp. 381-387).

Los Franciscanos y la independencia de Méjico. Elías Martínez (*Ábside,* Apr.-June, 1960, pp. 129-166).

La primera misión diplomática argentina ante la Santa Sede. Ricardo Zorraquin Becú (*Archivum,* July-Dec., 1945-1959, pp. 225-234).

Fray Mamerto Esquiú, Obispo de Córdoba (Argentina). Luis Cano, O.F.M. (*Archivo Ibero-Americano,* Apr.-June, 1960, pp. 167-203).

El pensamiento de Fray Mamerto Esquiú sobre historia argentina. Manuel A. Cárdenas (*Archivum,* July-Dec., 1945-1959, pp. 257-268).

Primer Congreso de católicos argentinos, 1884. Néstor Tomás Auza (*Archivum,* July-Dec., 1945-1959, pp. 235-256).

Le mariage sous le régime français. Paul-André Leclerc (*Revue d'Histoire de l'Amérique Française,* June, 1960, pp. 34-60).

Canadians of Byelorussian Origin. V. J. Kaye (*Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa,* July-Sept., 1960, pp. 300-314).

Some Letters of Benedict Leonard Calvert. Michael G. Hall (*William and Mary Quarterly,* July, 1960, pp. 358-370).

A Facet of Sovereignty: The Proprietary Governor and the Maryland Charter. James High (*Maryland Historical Magazine,* June, 1960, pp. 67-81).

The Church of England and Religious Liberty at Pre-Revolutionary Yale. Louis Leonard Tucker (*William and Mary Quarterly,* July, 1960, pp. 314-328).

"Damned Plague Ships and Swimming Coffins." Mary Cable (*American Heritage,* Aug., 1960, pp. 74-80, 96-97).

The Schwenninger Memorial, II. Gunther R. Rolfson, O.S.B. (*American Benedictine Review,* Sept.-Dec., 1959, pp. 245-265).

The Conservative Dilemma: The Massachusetts Constitutional Convention of 1853. Samuel Shapira (*New England Quarterly,* June, 1960, pp. 207-224).

Sterilization: A Progressive Measure? Rudolph J. Vecoli (*Wisconsin Magazine of History,* Spring, 1960, pp. 190-202).

The Very Reverend Urban de Hasque, S.T.D., L.L.D., Pioneer Priest of Indian Territory. Velma Nieberding (*Chronicles of Oklahoma,* Spring, 1960, pp. 35-42).

CONTEMPORARY

The Coronation Oath and the Church of England. C. L. Berry (*Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* Apr., 1960, pp. 98-105).

Economic Aspects of German Intervention in the Spanish Civil War, 1936-1939. Eugene H. Korth, S.J. (*Mid-America,* July, 1960, pp. 151-169).

Polonia 1939: prima tappa di una guerra crudele. A. Martini, S.I. (*La Civiltà Cattolica,* May 21, 1960, pp. 353-371).

Dom Lambert Beauduin. Polycarp R. Sherwood, O.S.B. (*American Benedictine Review,* Sept.-Dec., 1959, pp. 195-204).

English Spiritual Writers. XVIII. Father Bede Jarrett, O.P. Gervase Mathew, O.P. (*Clergy Review,* June, 1960, pp. 321-324).

Una stupenda figura di uomo e di sacerdote: P. Rupert Mayer, S.I. P. Molinari, S.I. (*La Civiltà Cattolica,* May 7, 1960, pp. 254-263).

P. Rupert Mayer: un eroico difensore dei diritti della Chiesa contro il nazismo. P. Molinari, S.I. (*La Civiltà Cattolica,* June 18, 1960, pp. 588-603).

Emmanuel Mounier: A Catholic of the Left. Donald Wolf, S.J. (*Review of Politics,* July, 1960, pp. 324-344).

Some Last Letters of Algar Thorold. Michael Hanbury, O.S.B. (*Pax,* Summer, 1960, pp. 55-62).

BOOKS RECEIVED

Anderson, Floyd. *Father Baker.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1960. Pp. viii, 151. $3.00.) A popular biography of the founder of the houses of charity in Lackawanna, New York, by the managing editor of the *Advocate,* weekly paper of the Archdiocese of Newark.

Armitage, Merle. *Pagans, Conquistadores, Heroes and Martyrs.* (Fresno: Academy Library Guild. 1960. Pp. 99. $2.75.)

Aveling, Hugh. *Post Reformation Catholicism in East Yorkshire, 1558-1790.* [East Yorkshire Local History Series: No. 11.] (York: East Yorkshire Local History Society. Pp. 70. 5/—.)

Baringer, William E. and Earl S. Miers (Editor-in-Chief). *Lincoln Day by Day: A Chronology.* Vol. 1: *1809-1848;* Vol. II: *1849-1860.* (Washington: Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission. 1960. Pp. xx, 327; viii, 305. $2.00 each.)

Barry, Colman J., O.S.B. *Readings in Church History.* Vol. I: *From Pentecost to the Protestant Revolt.* (Westminster: Newman Press. 1960. Pp. xx, 633. $7.50.)

Beals, Carleton. *Brass-Knuckle Crusade. The Great Know-Nothing Conspiracy: 1820-1860.* [American Procession Series.] (New York: Hastings House, Publishers, Inc. 1960. Pp. viii, 312. $5.95.)

Bien, David D. *The Calas Affair: Persecution, Toleration, and Heresy in Eighteenth-Century Toulouse.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1960. Pp. ix, 199. $4.00.)

Black, R. D. Collison. *Economic Thought and the Irish Question: 1817-1870.* (New York: Cambridge University Press. 1960. Pp. xiv, 298. $7.00.)

Bourret, F. M. *Ghana. The Road to Independence: 1919-1957.* (Stanford: Stanford University Press. 1960. Pp. xiii, 246. $5.75.) Mother Bourret of the University of the Sacred Heart in Tokyo has here brought up to date her able monograph that was first published in 1919, emphasizing in the final two chapters the recent developments up to Ghana's independence in 1957.

Bozeman, Adda B. *Politics and Culture in International History.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1960. Pp. xiii, 560. $10.00.)

Bury, J. P. T. (Ed.). *The New Cambridge Modern History.* Vol. X: *The Zenith of European Power: 1830-70.* (New York: Cambridge University Press. 1960. Pp. xxi, 765. $7.50.)

Carman, Harry J. and Arthur W. Thompson. *A Guide to the Principal Sources for American Civilization, 1800-1900, in the City of New York: Manuscripts.* (New York: Columbia University Press. 1960. Pp. xlviii, 453. $10.00.)

Chavez, Angelico, O.F.M. *The Lady from Toledo.* (Fresno: Academy Library Guild. 1960. Pp. 165. $3.95.) A novel about Santa Fe with Maria Romero, daughter of the high sheriff, as chief character; illustrations by the author.

Corte, Nicolas. *Pierre Teilhard de Chardin: His Life and Spirit.* (New York: Macmillan Co. 1960. Pp. xx, 120. $3.25.)

Cronon, E. David. *Josephus Daniels in Mexico.* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press. 1960. Pp. xiii, 369. $6.00.

Daniel, Norman. *Islam and the West: The Making of an Image.* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, Inc. 1960. Pp. ix, 443. $12.50.)

Dawson, Christopher. *America and the Secularization of Modern Culture.* (Houston: University of St. Thomas, 1960. Pp. 31. $1.00.) The Smith Lecture sponsored by the Department of History of the University of St. Thomas.

De Achútegui, Pedro S., S.J. and Miguel A. Bernad, S.J. *Religious Revolution in the Philippines: Life and Church of Gregorio Aglipay, 1860-1960.* Vol. I: *1860-1940.* (Manila: Bookmark. 1960. Pp. xiv, 578. $15.00.)

de Bertier de Sauvigny, G. *Metternich et son temps.* (Paris: Librarie Hatchette. 1959. Pp. 272. 900 fr.)

Dennis, George T., S.J. *The Reign of Manual II Palaeologus in Thessalonica: 1382-1387.* [Orientalia Christiana Analecta, 159.] (Romae: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum. 1960. Pp. x, 179. Lire 1,200.)

Dickson, Charles. *Revolt in the North: Antrim and Down in 1798.* (Dublin: Clonmore & Reynolds. 1960. Pp. 257. 21/—.)

Doerries, Hermann. Translated by Roland H. Bainton. *Constantine and Religious Liberty.* (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1960. Pp. xi, 141. $4.00.)

Drower, E. S. *The Secret Adam: A Study of Nasoraean Gnosis.* (New York: Oxford University Press. 1960. Pp. xvii, 123. $4.00.)

Dunleavy, Gareth W. *Colum's Other Island: The Irish at Lindisfarne.* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press. 1960. Pp. x, 149. $4.50.)

Durkin, Joseph T., S.J. (Ed.). James B. Sheeran, C.SS.R. *Confederate Chaplain: A War Journal.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1960. Pp. xiii, 168. $3.50.)

Ehrenberg, Victor. *The Greek State.* (New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc. 1960. Pp. xii, 280. $7.00.)

Esposito, Mario (Ed.). *Itinerarium symonis semeonis ab hybernia ad terram sanctam.* Vol. IV: *Scriptores Latini hiberniae.* (Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies. 1960. Pp. 127. 25/—.)

Evans, Clifford and Betty J. Meggers. *Archeological Investigations in British Guiana.* [Smithsonian Institution Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 177.] (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office. 1960. Pp. xxi, 418; plates 68.)

Ezell, John Samuel. *Fortune's Merry Wheel: The Lottery in America.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1960. Pp. viii, 331. $6.75.)

Fenton, John H. *The Catholic Vote.* [Galleon Books.] (New Orleans: Hauser Press. 1960. Pp. xv, 146. $4.75.)

Fogarty, Ronald, F.M.S. *Catholic Education in Australia: 1806-1950.* Vol. I: *Catholic Schools and the Denominational System.* Vol. II: *Catholic Education under the Religious Orders.* (New York: Cambridge University Press. 1960. Pp. xxi, 255; ix, 567. $17.50. [two volumes].)

Forster, Robert. *The Nobility of Toulouse in the Eighteenth Century: A Social and Economic Study.* [Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, Series LXXVIII, No. 1.] (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1960. Pp. 212. $3.50.)

Freidel, Frank. *America in the Twentieth Century.* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1960. Pp. xxii, 593; xxiii [Index.] $6.75.)

Fullard, Harold (Ed.). *The Barnes and Noble World Atlas.* (New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc. 1960. Pp. 124. $1.95.) This handy atlas was prepared by George Philip & Son, Ltd., the London Geographical Institute of which Mr. Fullard is the cartographic editor.

Gooch, G. P. *The Second Empire.* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., Ltd. 1960. Pp. x, 324. 30/—net.)

Gordon, C. D. *The Age of Attila: Fifth-Century Byzantium and the Barbarians.* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. 1960. Pp. xix, 228. $3.95.)

Guardini, Roman. Translated by Elinor Briefs. *The Conversion of Augustine.* (Westminster: Newman Press. 1960. Pp. xviii, 258. $3.95.)

Hebgin, Dame Scholastica, and Dame Felicitas Corrigan (Translators). *St. Augustine on the Psalms.* [Ancient Christian Writers.] (Westminster: Newman Press. 1960. Pp. vi, 354. $4.50.)

Hoppenbrouwers, H., O.S.B. *La plus ancienne version Latine de la vie de S. Antoine par S. Anthanase. Étude de Critique Textuele.* [Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva.] (Utrecht-Nijmegen: Dekker & Van de Vegt. Pp. xiii, 220. fl. 12.—.)

Journals of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts, 1757. XXXIII, Part 2. (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society. 1960. Pp. viii, 498. $7.50.)

Kelly, George A. *Overpopulation: A Catholic View.* (New York: Paulist Press. 1960. Pp. 96. 75¢.)

Kerwin, Jerome G. *Catholic Viewpoint on Church and State.* [Catholic Viewpoint Series edited by John J. Delaney.] (New York: Doubleday & Co. 1960. Pp. 192. $3.50.)

Kirchner, Walther. *Western Civilization to 1500.* (College Outline Series.] (New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc. 1960. Pp. xvii, 326. $1.95.)

Laporte, Jean. *Le Penitential de Saint Colomban.* [Monumenta Christiana Selecta. Vol. IV.] (Tournai: Desclée & Cie. 1960. Pp. 111.)

Laporte, Pierre. *The True Face of Duplessis.* (Montreal: Harvest House Limited. 1960. Pp. 140. $1.50.) The first critical biography of the French Canadian statesman who served as Prime Minister of Quebec for two decades; written by a newspaper correspondent who observed his subject for many years from the press gallery.

Lesie, Anita. *Mrs. Fitzherbert: A Biography.* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1960. Pp. 239. $5.00.)

Major, J. Russell. *Representative Institutions in Renaissance France: 1421-1559.* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press. 1960. Pp. ix, 182. $4.00.)

Masterson, James R. (Ed.). *Writings on American History: 1953.* (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office. 1960. Pp. xiv, 705. $3.00.) Volume II of the Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the year 1955. Compiled by a staff member of the National Historical Publications Commission, this volume is designed to cite every book and article published during 1953 that has any considerable value for study or research pertaining to the history of the United States from primitive times to the war in Korea. The whole history of the areas now within the territory of this country or under its jurisdiction is included in this list. The entries are clearly classified and thoroughly indexed. Under the titles "National History, Cultural History, Religion, Catholics" thirty-four titles are listed.

McKitrick, Eric L. *Andrew Johnson and Reconstruction.* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1960. Pp. ix, 533. $8.50.)

Meyer, Carl S. *Elizabeth I and the Religious Settlement of 1559.* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House. 1960. Pp. viii, 182. $4.95.)

Moir, John S. *Church and State in Canada West: 1841-1867.* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1959. Pp. xv, 223. $4.75.)

Morrow, Glenn R. *Plato's Cretan City: A Historical Interpretation of the Laws.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1960. Pp. xxii, 623. $12.50.)

Murray, John Courtney, S.J. *We Hold These Truths.* (New York: Sheed & Ward. 1960. Pp. xiv, 336. $5.00.)

O'Brien, Conor Cruise (Ed.). *The Shaping of Modern Ireland.* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1960. Pp. vi, 201. $3.50.)

Olmstead, Clifton E. *History of Religion in the United States.* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1960. Pp. xii, 628. $7.50.)

Olschki, Leonardo. Translated from the Italian by John A. Scott. *Marco Polo's Asia.* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. Pp. ix, 459. $10.00.)

Prodi, Paolo. *Il Cardinale Gabriele Paleotti (1522-1597) I.* (Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura. 1959. Pp. 232. L. 3000.)

Ricciotti, Giuseppe. *Julian the Apostate.* Translated by M. Joseph Costelloe, S.J. (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1960. Pp. x, 275. $4.75.)

Rojas, A. R. *Last of the Vaqueros.* (Fresno: Academy Library Guild. Pp. 165. $3.75.)

Rostovtzeff, M. *Rome.* Translated from the Russian by I. P. Duff. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1960. Pp. xiii, 347. $2.25.) A Galaxy Book edition prepared with the assistance of Elias J. Bickerman.

Ruiz, D. Angel Santos. *Discurso: Correspondiente a la solemne apertura del curso academico, 1959-1960.* (Madrid: Universidad de Madrid. 1959. Pp. 100.)

Saloutos, Theodore. *Farmer Movements in the South: 1865-1933.* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. 1960. Pp. ix, 354. $6.50.)

Schmandt, Henry J. *A History of Political Philosophy.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1960. Pp. viii, 499. $5.50.) A college textbook designed for the political science, history, or general social science curriculum by an associate professor at the University of Wisconsin (Milwaukee).

Schopenhauer, Arthur. *Essay on the Freedom of the Will.* (New York: Liberal Arts Press. 1960. Pp. xx, 103. 80¢.)

Scoville, Warren Candler. *The Persecution of Huguenots and French Economic Development: 1680-1720.* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. 1960. Pp. x, 497. $6.50.)

Selmer, Carl. *Navigatio Sancti Brendani Abbatis.* [Publications in Mediaeval Studies. Vol. XVI.] (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press. 1960. Pp. li, 132. $4.75.)

Sheehan, Donald and Harold C. Syrett. *Essays in American Historiography: Papers Presented in Honor of Allan Nevins.* (New York: Columbia University Press. 1960. Pp. x, 320. $6.00.)

Shipton, Clifford K. *Sibley's Harvard Graduates, XI: 1741-1745.* (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society. 1960. Pp. xiv, 649. $7.50.) Biographical sketches of those who attended Harvard College in the Classes 1741-1745 with bibliographical and other notes.

Smith, H. Shelton, Robert T. Handy, Lefferts A. Loetscher. *American Christianity: An Historical Interpretation with Representative Documents.* Vol. I: *1607-1820.* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1960. Pp. xv, 615. $10.00.)

Anthropological Papers: Numbers 57-62. [Smithsonian Institution. Bureau of American Ethnology. Bulletin 173.] (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office. 1960. Pp. iii, 498.)

Sofranov, Ivan. *Histoire du mouvement Bulgare. Vers l'Église Catholique au XIX^e siècle.* Premiere Periode: *Les Origines: 1855-1865.* [Bibliotheque Catholique Bulgare.] (Roma: Desclée & Cie. 1960. Pp. xxiii, 400.)

Spier, Leslie, A. Irving Hallowell, and Stanley S. Newman (Eds.). *Language, Culture and Personality: Essays in Memory of Edward Sapir.* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press. 1960. Pp. xii, 298. $3.75.)

Sutcliffe, Edmund F., S.J. *The Monks of Qumran.* (Westminster: Newman Press. 1960. Pp. xvi, 272. $5.50.)

Talpalar, Morris. *The Sociology of Colonial Virginia.* (New York: Philosophical Library, Inc. 1960. Pp. xi, 371. $6.00.)

Van Tassel, David D. *Recording America's Past: An Interpretation of the Development of Historical Studies in America: 1607-1884.* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1960. Pp. xii, 222. $6.00.)